The *Fukan zazen-gi* and the Meditation Teachings of the Japanese Zen Master Dōgen

By

Carl William Bielefeldt

A.B. (San Francisco State University) 1966
M.A. (University of California) 1972

DISSERTATION

Submitted in partial satisfaction of the requirements for the degree of

DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

in

Buddhist Studies

in the

GRADUATE DIVISION

OF THE

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA, BERKELEY

Approved: Lewis R. Lancaster .... May 6, 1980
Chairman .... Date
William B. McCullough .... May 7, 1980
Michael Freeman .... 7 May 1980

DOCTORAL DEGREE CONFERRED
JUNE 14, 1980

THE *FUKAN ZAZEN-GI*
AND THE MEDITATION TEACHINGS
OF THE JAPANESE ZEN MASTER DŌGEN

by

Carl Bielefeldt

PREFACE

This paper was planned as a general study of Dōgen's meditation doctrine, focused on the FKZZG but including material from the SBGZ zazen-shin and other of his writings. As the work progressed I became increasingly aware of the various textual and historical problems which (the wealth of secondary material notwithstanding) still confront any such doctrinal study of Dōgen, and my attention gradually shifted to some of these problems. Consideration of Dōgen's meditation teaching itself, then, was relegated to the final chapters, in the event probably the weakest of the paper. Unfortunately, time and the pressure of other responsibilities did not permit the inclusion here of the annotation to the translations given in the appendix. I have tried to provide some of this material in the notes on passages appearing in the body of the essay and hope to bring out the complete annotation in another context.

Research for this paper was carried out at the Jinbun Kagaku Kenkyū-jo, Kyoto University, under grants from the Japan Foundation and the Social Science Research Council. Additional support was provided by a grant from the North East Asia Council of the Association for Asian Studies which allowed me access to the collection of the East Asiatic Library at Berkeley. I should like to express my thanks to

Prof. Kajiyama Yūichi of Kyoto University for his kind assistance and gracious hospitality during my stay in Kyoto; to the San Francisco Zen Center for making their Kyoto house available to me and my family; to Hisao Matsumoto of the Library of Congress, who generously put his staff and his photoreproduction equipment at my disposal; to my wife, Fumiko, for copying out the texts in the appendix; to Prof. Lewis Lancaster and the other members of my committee for their patience and good will throughout the course of my work with them; and especially to Prof. Yanagida Seizan of the Jinbun Kagaku Kenkyū-jo, who compassionately opened the great store of his knowledge to me during my many hours with him in Kyoto, and to whom I humbly dedicate this work.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ABBREVIATIONS

DZZ	*Dōgen zenji zenshū* 道元禅師全集. Ed. by Ōkubo Dōshū 大久保道舟.
EHKR	*Eihei kōroku* 永平広録.
FKZZG	*Fukan zazen-gi* 普勧坐禅儀.
IBK	*Indogaku bukkyōgaku kenkyū* 印度学仏教学研究.
KDBGKK	*Komazawa daigaku bukkyō gakubu kenkyū kiyō* 駒沢大学仏教学部研究紀要.
SBGZ	*Shōbō genzō* 正法眼蔵.
SK	*Shūgaku kenkyū* 宗学研究.
SSZ	*Sōtō-shū zensho* 曹洞宗全書.
T	*Taishō shinshū daizōkyō* 大正新脩大蔵経.
ZZ	*Dai Nihon zoku zōkyō* 大日本続蔵経.

INTRODUCTION

Few figures in the history of Ch'an and Zen have been as closely associated with the teaching of meditation as the Japanese Zen master Dōgen 道元 (1220-1253), founder of the Sōtō 曹洞 school. This is true, not only because he strongly advocated meditation practice, but because he identified seated meditation (zazen 坐禪) with the very core of the Buddhist religious tradition. Consequently, it is hardly surprising that references to this practice abound in Dōgen's writings; indeed, there is a sense in which the entire corpus of his work can be viewed as an explication of zazen. Still, there are certain texts of this corpus which deal explicitly with seated meditation and with which clearly any study of Dōgen's teachings on the topic must begin. By far the most famous and important of these is the Fukan zazen-gi 普勸坐禪儀, "Universal promotion of the principles of zazen."

The FKZZG is generally thought to represent Dōgen's first Zen teaching, promulgated immediately following his return to Japan after several years of training in Sung China. As the opening act of his ministry, intended to reveal the very essence of the message he sought to bring to the Japanese Buddhist community, its composition is widely

regarded as marking the historical origin of his school. The Tokugawa Sōtō scholar Menzan, in the preface to his influential commentary on the FKZZG, hailed it as "the dawn of Buddhism in Japan." This historical significance for the tradition, coupled with the work's intrinsic importance as the primary source for the tradition's characteristic form of meditation practice, has given the FKZZG a central place in the literature of the Sōtō school. Indeed, it has been taken into the litany of the church and is still recited daily during the evening meditation periods at the school's monasteries throughout Japan.

The FKZZG is a brief tract in one roll of roughly 800 graphs, composed in a florid *kanbun* style and devoted to an explanation of both the theory and the procedures of *zazen* practice. It is extant in two versions: one, that of a manuscript thought to be an autograph from Dōgen's early years; the other, the vulgate, of somewhat more problematic provenance but probably composed during the last decade of his life.

The existence of these two versions of the FKZZG from two different points in Dōgen's career makes the work a key document for the study of the development of his religious views; for the autograph and vulgate texts show a number of quite interesting differences in their approach to, and explanation of, meditation practice. Fortunately, for this study we have access to several other of Dōgen's works on meditation which help us to place the composition of the two

versions in a larger context and to better understand the relationship of their contents. At the same time, the FKZZG offers us one of our best sources for exploring the complex question of how Dōgen's own presentation of *zazen* is related to the Chinese tradition he inherits. Much of the text is based directly on a twelfth century Ch'an manual, a work which itself draws heavily on earlier Chinese meditation tradition. Interestingly enough, elsewhere Dōgen explicitly rejects this manual as failing to convey the true meaning of *zazen*, and in fact in his FKZZG he significantly revises the text to his own ends. The examination of where and why he does so throws much light on his position in the intellectual history of Ch'an and Zen. To a large extent it is with topics related to this question that the present paper is concerned.

Given its historical importance for the Sōtō tradition and its value as a source for the study of Dōgen, it is not surprising that the FKZZG has attracted the attention of Japanese scholars both within and outside Dōgen's school. In addition to the traditional commentaries of Tokugawa scholars such as Menzan and Shigetsu, today there exists a large and growing body of secondary literature on the work. This literature includes a quantity of quite helpful material, but in many respects the study of the FKZZG -- like that of Dōgen in general -- has tended to proceed within rather narrow confines; while some progress has been made on various textual and historical problems, and much has been said

about the doctrine of the FKZZG, it must be admitted that a considerable number of questions remain.

The following essay is less an attempt to answer such questions than it is an effort to raise some of them. It should be obvious to anyone engaged in the study of Dōgen that this field is undergoing something of a revolution. In particular, the discovery in recent years of new documents and the publication, still under way, of the early manuscripts relating to Dōgen are forcing the reappraisal of a number of our opinions regarding his life and teaching. In many basic areas this process has just begun, but already it invites us to reread the works of Dōgen and to rethink our interpretations of them. This paper represents a first attempt at one such rereading. It is not, therefore, a comprehensive study of the FKZZG, much less of Dōgen's meditation teachings; it is, rather, a form of prologomenon to such a study, which seeks, on the one hand, to review what is now known about the work and, on the other, to raise certain questions, to locate problem areas, and to indicate possible new paths of inquiry. At times -- particularly in its final chapters -- it takes on the role of devil's advocate, and in general it is less concerned with completing a new picture of Dōgen than it is with calling attention to the fact that our present picture is considerably less complete than is generally acknowledged.

While there is no intention here to provide a single unified interpretation of the FKZZG, still we may note at

the outset two general themes which underlie our approach to the material, and which make that approach somewhat different from previous studies. One concerns the relative importance placed on the Chinese background of Dōgen's meditation doctrine. For the most part, in the literature on the FKZZG -- as in that on Dōgen in general -- the question of the Chinese sources for, and influences on, his work has either been ignored or manipulated to sectarian advantage. Hence, one often comes away from this literature with a sense that, if Dōgen did not himself invent zazen, then he radically transformed it into a unique spiritual practice without precedent in the Chinese Ch'an tradition. This view is probably unfair both to the tradition and to Dōgen. For he himself repeatedly emphasizes that his way is the way of the Patriarchs of Ch'an, and in fact almost everything in the FKZZG -- including its very phrasing -- is drawn from the earlier literature of the school. It is certainly true that Dōgen uses that literature to his own ends, and undoubtedly his meditation doctrine represents a real contribution to the history of Ch'an and Zen thought; but that contribution is developed through a reformulation of insights and attitudes basic to the tradition as a whole. Indeed, there is much in Dōgen -- both in his dogma and in the sectarian spirit with which he argues for it -- that is reminiscent of the early teachings of the Southern school. And just as those teachings can only be properly evaluated in the light of the Chinese Mahāyāna tradition which informs them, so the interpretation

of Dōgen's system must proceed through an adequate understanding of its sources. This is, needless to say, a large and complex area, one deserving of much more -- and more careful -- attention than it receives here. Its treatment in this paper is intended simply to emphasize its importance and to suggest something of its dimensions.

This brings us to a second, and closely related, theme of the paper, one which concerns the perplexing question of the relationship between meditation theory and its practice. Implicit in much of the argument of the latter part of this essay is the premise that it is possible and -- at least as a heuristic device -- fruitful to distinguish between the practical and theoretical components of zazen, and that a new theory of practice -- not to mention a new formulation of an old theory -- does not necessarily imply a new practice. This premise is generally rejected by most commentators on Dōgen, as indeed it would undoubtedly be by Dōgen himself. On the contrary, it is widely maintained that the great virtue of his famous meditation teaching of "just sitting" (shikan taza 只管打坐) lies precisely in the fact that it perfectly unifies theory and practice. Because of this unification, his zazen is held by its proponents to be different from, and superior to, the more utilitarian approach of the better-known Rinzai tradition. Here again, as we shall emphasize, Dōgen's position is more or less that taken by the Southern school in its criticism of the "gradual" approach to Buddhist practice. Yet it should be recognized

that this position is itself a theoretical one and in itself tells us very little about whether -- and if so how -- the meditation practice of its exponents actually differed from that of their adversaries. The case is rather like that of Christian arguments over the soteriological role of works: they need not imply real differences in the understanding of what, practically speaking, such works entail. The possibility that Dōgen's shikan taza doctrine had practical implications for the content of his zazen cannot be discounted; the point is only that we need not assume that it did. Given the nature of the case, it may be impossible to determine this matter, but the recognition of that fact itself would probably constitute an advance in our perception of Dōgen's meditation teachings.

THE TEXTS OF THE *FUKAN ZAZEN-GI* (I): THE TENPUKU MANUSCRIPT AND THE KAROKU *ZAZEN-GI*

The oldest known text of the *FKZZG* is an ancient manuscript belonging to Eihei-ji 永平寺, the head monastery of the Sōtō school. The existence of this document first came to the attention of the scholarly community in 1922, when it was put on public display at Tokyo Imperial University.[1] The manuscript, in one roll, is in a remarkable state of preservation. Its mounting, which appears to date from the late Edo period, bears a colophon identifying the text as an authentic example of Dōgen's calligraphy (*shinpitsu* 眞筆) and stating that it was donated (presumably to Eihei-ji) by the calligraphy expert Kohitsu Ryōhan 古筆了伴 (1827-53). An inscription on the lid of the box in which the manuscript is preserved indicates that the donation was made in the eighth month of the fifth year of Kaei 嘉永 (September 1852).[2] Unfortunately, we have no information on the earlier history of the manuscript nor on how it fell into Ryōhan's possession; judging from its state of preservation it would appear that it was little handled over the centuries and lay largely unstudied in some private or institutional library. There is no evidence in the literature of the Sōtō school that its contents were known to the tradition.[3]

The FKZZG manuscript is written on elegantly illustrated paper, thought to be of Sung manufacture, in a kaisho 楷書 script following the Sung style; the calligraphy as well as the signature (kaō 花押) accord well with other manuscripts attributed to Dōgen. Thus, there is every reason to believe that the inscription on the mounting is correct in its assessment of the text's authenticity. In 1941 and again in 1952 the FKZZG manuscript was judged an autograph and designated a National Treasure (kokuhō 国宝) by a commission of the Japanese government.[4]

The manuscript bears a colophon indicating that it was written on the fifteenth day of the seventh month of the first year of Tenpuku 天福 (August 21, 1233) at Kannon-dōri-in 觀音導利院. Thus, we know that the work dates from Dōgen's thirty-third year; it was composed six years after his return from China and shortly following his move to the monastery at Fukakusa 深草 that was to become his residence for the next decade. The exact date of this move is unknown, but it appears from the colophon of the SBGZ maka-hannya-haramitta 正法眼藏摩訶般若波羅蜜多 (DZZ, 1, 13) that Dōgen held a meditation retreat (ango 安居) at Kannon-dōri-in during the summer of 1233. This was probably the first such retreat at his new quarters and was undoubtedly a rather humble affair: two years later, in 1235, he was still seeking donations for the construction of a monks' hall (sōdō 僧堂) in which to carry out proper meditation practice.[5]

The date of the Tenpuku manuscript corresponds to the day known as gege 解夏, the end of the summer retreat.[6] Presumably, the work was connected with that retreat and reflects Dōgen's meditation teachings during the preceding period. Unfortunately, we have no information on the names or the number of those attending the 1233 ango. It appears that Dōgen was in the habit at this time of lecturing to both monks and laymen, and we know that he counted among his supporters several influential members of the Heian aristocracy. Given the quality of its paper and the obvious care with which it was copied, one is tempted to speculate that the FKZZG manuscript was presented to one of the more important persons participating in, or supporting, the summer retreat.[7]

It is generally held that the Tenpuku manuscript is not an original work but represents a copy of an earlier meditation text no longer extant. The evidence for the existence of such a text comes from two sources, the Bendō-wa 辨道話 and the so-called "FKZZG senjutsu yurai" 普勸坐禪儀撰述由來. At the conclusion of the former, in the course of explaining his reasons for composing the Bendō-wa, Dōgen adds,

> The procedures of zazen should be carried out in accordance with the Fukan zazen-gi composed during the Karoku era. (DZZ, 1, 746, 763.)

Similarly, in the "Senjutsu yurai," after lamenting

the fact that no zazen-gi had previously been transmitted to Japan, Dōgen says,

> When I returned to this country from the land of the Sung in the Karoku era, there were students who asked me [to compose a zazen-gi], and so I felt obliged to go ahead and compose one. (DZZ, 2, 6.)[8]

If Dōgen originally composed the FKZZG in the Karoku 嘉禄 era, then he must have set to work on it almost immediately upon his return to Japan. Early sources for Dōgen's biography do not agree on the exact date of that return, and the issue has long been a subject of dispute. We know, however, from the certificate of transmission (shisho 嗣書) which Dōgen received from his Chinese master, Ju-ching 如淨, that Dōgen was still at T'ien-t'ung Shan 天童山 during the third year of the Chinese Pao-ch'ing 寶慶 era (1227). (DZZ, 2, 287.) On the fifth day of the tenth month (November 15) of this year he wrote a brief note in Japan, entitled "Shari sōden ki" 舍利相傳記, concerning the delivery of his teacher Myōzen's 明全 remains to one of the latter's disciples. (DZZ, 2, 396.) Hence, it is clear that Dōgen must have reached Japan in the third year of Karoku (1227) sometime prior to the tenth month. On the basis of seasonal patterns in the ship movements between the continent and Japan, most scholars now place the date in the eighth month.[9] On the tenth day of the twelfth

month (January 18, 1228) the era name was changed from Karoku to Antei 安貞. We may assume, therefore, that the Karoku zazen-gi was composed sometime during the latter half of 1227, within a few months of Dōgen's return to Japan.

It is often said that the Karoku zazen-gi was composed at Kennin-ji 建仁寺, the monastery where Dōgen studied prior to his departure for China and to which he returned following his sojourn abroad. The evidence for this view, however, is not very strong. We know from his Tenzo kyōkun 典座教訓 (DZZ, 2, 300) that Dōgen did spend several years at Kennin-ji following his return to Japan, but the text does not tell us when he began his stay. In the SBGZ zuimonki 隨聞記 (DZZ, 2, 438) he refers to his experience at Kennin-ji, lamenting the fact that the spiritual atmosphere of the monastery had much declined during the "seven or eight years" since he first entered it; but since we do not know when he originally entered, this does not help us to date the beginning of his second stay.[10]

The notion that the Karoku zazen-gi was written at Kennin-ji seems to be based solely on the evidence of the "Shari sōden ki," which is said to prove that Dōgen was established at the monastery by the tenth month of 1227, when he handed over Myōzen's shari to a certain Chi 智.[11] Yet it is nowhere stated, nor need we assume, that this event took place at Kennin-ji. Even granted that it did, this does not, of course, tell us anything of Dōgen's whereabouts

before and after this date. In fact, other evidence suggests that he may not have settled at Kennin-ji until sometime after the Karoku era.

In the Bendō-wa (DZZ, 1, 729-30, 741) Dōgen states that he "returned home" (honkyō ni kaerishi 本郷にかへりし) at the beginning of the Shao-ting 紹定 era of the Sung. Since this era did not begin until the first day (February 7) of 1228, the statement seems to imply that Dōgen was still in China after the end of Karoku. Given the strength of the evidence for his return in 1227, many scholars simply ignore the Bendō-wa passage as a mistake. Others have tried various explanations to reconcile the two dates. The most promising suggestion would seem to be that Dōgen reached Japan (probably in Kyūshū) prior to the tenth month of 1227 but did not reach "home" -- i.e., Heian -- until the following year. This theory would mean, of course, that the Karoku zazen-gi was not written at Kennin-ji.[12]

The only other source on Dōgen's activities during this period is an entry in the Hottō kokushi gyōjitsu nenpu 法燈國師行實年譜, which records the fact that on the fifteenth day of the tenth month (November 25) of 1227 Dōgen participated, along with the reknowned Kegon master Myōe Kōben 明慧高辨 (1173-1232), in the opening of Saihō-ji 西方寺 (later known as Kōkoku-ji 興國寺) at Yura 由良 in Kii province.[13] Saihō-ji was built by the monk Ganshō 願性 (d. 1275), formerly Katsurayama Kagetomo 葛山景倫, follower of the third Kamakura Shōgun, Minamoto no Sanetomo.

After Sanetomo's assassination in 1219, Kagetomo took Buddhist vows and dedicated Saihō-ji to the memory of his departed lord. We know that Dōgen counted among his strong early patrons a nun named Shōkaku, who may have been the former wife of Sanetomo. On the basis of these connections, it has been suggested that Dōgen's trip to China was supported by Genshō and Sanetomo's followers in Kyoto, and that upon his return he made his way directly to the site of the late Shōgun's memorial temple (bodai-ji 菩提寺) at Yura, where he remained until the following year. According to this view, then, the Karoku zazen-gi was most probably composed during Dōgen's stay at Saihō-ji.[14]

Given the scarcity of the evidence, this theory of Dōgen's itinerary remains highly speculative. We must remember that the Hottō kokushi nenpu notice does not explicitly state that Dōgen actually attended the opening ceremony at Saihō-ji, but only that he wrote the graphs for the monastery plaque, a job he presumably could have done in Kyoto. Nevertheless, the theory is attractive: not only does it explain the troublesome Bendō-wa date for Dōgen's return, but the Sanetomo connection also accords well with other facts in Dōgen's biography. At the very least, it clearly indicates the danger of accepting too easily the widely held view that the Karoku zazen-gi was composed at Kennin-ji.[15]

We have previously noted that the Tenpuku manuscript of the FKZZG is generally assumed to be a copy (seisho 清書)

of the Karoku zazen-gi. This assumption is based on two grounds. First, and most obviously, the Bendō-wa passage on the FKZZG we have quoted above explicitly states that the work was composed in the Karoku era. Ordinarily, this might seem sufficient reason for concluding that the extant text, though dated later, is a copy of the earlier work. In this case, however, both the value and the implications of the evidence are open to doubt. The Bendō-wa is a notoriously problematic text, the authenticity of which has long been the subject of controversy. The discovery in this century of the Shōbō-ji 正法寺 manuscript has done much to allay doubts regarding the provenance of the work, and there are few scholars today who would seriously question its attribution to Dōgen. Nevertheless, the many significant differences between the Shōbō-ji and vulgate versions strongly suggest that the text has undergone considerable revision during the course of its transmission. Indeed, it has recently been suggested that the passage on the Karoku zazen-gi represents such a revision, and that it was not included in Dōgen's original version.[16]

These doubts regarding the Bendō-wa suggest the need for caution in using this work as a historical source. Yet even if we accept the authenticity of its reference to the FKZZG, we have not established the identity of the Karoku and Tenpuku texts. We know from his other works that Dōgen was in the habit of editing and revising his writings, and we cannot rule out that possibility here. In fact, the two

extant texts of the FKZZG show marked divergences, and it is certainly quite possible that similar or greater differences existed between the Karoku and Tenpuku zazen-gi. Nor would it be surprising if the Tenpuku FKZZG reflected something of its author's experience during the six years since his return to Japan and of his new situation as the abbot of a monastery and leader of a meditation retreat. Under the circumstances, then, it would seem rash to identify the Karoku and Tenpuku texts simply on the basis of an identity of title.[17]

A somewhat similar problem confronts us in the case of the second argument in support of the view that the Tenpuku manuscript is a copy of the earlier zazen-gi. The argument is based on the content of the document, introduced above, commonly referred to as the "FKZZG senjutsu yurai." This brief note in Chinese is preserved in a manuscript, apparently in Dōgen's own hand, housed at Eihei-ji.[18] In the note, as we have seen, Dōgen refers to his Karoku zazen-gi; he then goes on to criticize the understanding of meditation found in the Tso-ch'an i 坐禪儀 of Tsung-tse's 宗賾 Ch'an-yüan ch'ing-kuei 禪苑清規, the inadequacies of which he felt made it necessary for him to compose his own meditation manual. Tsung-tse's work and Dōgen's criticism of it will be discussed in detail in subsequent sections of this paper; here it is sufficient simply to indicate that this criticism is well reflected in the Tenpuku manuscript. As we shall see, the Tenpuku FKZZG in fact represents a revision of the Tso-ch'an i, in which Dōgen redefines the

practice of Ch'an meditation. Hence, there is no doubt that the content of the Tenpuku manuscript agrees with Dōgen's stated purpose in writing his manual. Therefore, the argument goes, we may safely assume its identity with the Karoku _zazen-gi_ referred to in the "Senjutsu yurai."[19]

Obviously, here again the argument suffers from an excluded middle term: even if we grant that the Karoku _zazen-gi_, like the Tenpuku manuscript, was a revision of Tsung-tse's manual, it does not follow that the two works were identical. The fallacy is painfully conspicuous in this case, where we have a total of four extant meditation manuals by Dōgen, all of which represent greater or lesser revisions of the _Tso-ch'an i_.[20] If the argument from content were valid, we should expect all of these texts to be the same. In fact, of course, they are not. This formal weakness, moreover, is only one of the problems with the argument; of greater importance is the fact that it is based on what appears to be a misreading of the "Senjutsu yurai."

The passage on the composition of the _zazen-gi_ which we have quoted above is widely cited as evidence for the original date of the _FKZZG_. Unfortunately, it is almost always cited in isolation; surprisingly little attention has been paid to the context of the passage or to the historical character of the "Senjutsu yurai" itself. As a consequence, it is often assumed that the _zazen-gi_ mentioned in this passage is the work for which the "Senjutsu yurai" was intended as an explanation. It is this assumption which

stands behind the notion that the Karoku zazen-gi was critical of Tsung-tse's Tso-ch'an i. Yet a careful reading of the text reveals that it was not in fact written for the Karoku zazen-gi, nor does it explicitly connect that zazen-gi with the Chinese manual.

The "Senjutsu yurai" informs us that Dōgen returned to Japan in the Karoku era, was asked about meditation, and therefore felt obliged to write a manual of zazen. It then goes on to praise Po-chang 百丈 (720-814), author of the first Ch'an monastic code, and to criticize Tsung-tse for his failure to faithfully transmit Po-chang's meditation teachings. Finally, it closes with the statement,

> Now I gather the true secrets I have myself seen and heard, [offering them] simply as a substitute for what is received in the mind transmission. (DZZ, 2, 6.)

Although the date of the "Senjutsu yurai" is unknown, from the fact that it mentions Dōgen's return to Japan in the Karoku era it must obviously be put sometime after the end of that era. The last sentence clearly seems to indicate that the note was written on the occasion of the composition of the work for which it was an explanation. Needless to say, this work could not have been the Karoku zazen-gi. We appear to have here, then, two different works: one (the Karoku zazen-gi), which Dōgen says at the beginning of his note he felt obliged to compose for the

sake of students; another (unidentified), alluded to in the final sentence, for which Dōgen wrote the "Senjutsu yurai." It is this second work which seems to be offered as a correction of Tsung-tse's manual. Presumably it was also intended to improve upon Dōgen's own earlier efforts at a zazen-gi, for otherwise there would have been no need to compose it. Indeed, this presumption is strengthened by the rather apologetic tone Dōgen strikes in referring to his Karoku manual, which he wrote, as he says, only out of a sense of obligation. The "Senjutsu yurai," then, does not indicate that Dōgen's first zazen-gi was critical of Tsung-tse; far from establishing the identity of the Tenpuku and Karoku texts, in fact it suggests the possibility that the two may have been quite different.

Since the "Senjutsu yurai" is undated, it is impossible to say with any certainty for which of Dōgen's zazen-gi it was written. Obviously, the two most likely dates are (1) 1233, on the occasion of the composition of the Tenpuku FKZZG; and (2) sometime in or shortly after 1243, when, as we shall see, Dōgen composed his SBGZ zazen-gi and also his Kōroku revision of the FKZZG. Internal evidence would appear to support the former. The "Senjutsu yurai" opens with a lament over the fact that "the special transmission outside the scriptures, the treasury of the eye of the true dharma" (kyōge betsuden shōbōgenzō 教外別傳正法眼藏) has hitherto been unknown in Japan. In 1241 and apparently again in the following year Dōgen taught the SBGZ bukkyō

佛教, a work devoted largely to a severe criticism of the famous Ch'an dictum of a "special transmission outside the scriptures." One wonders, therefore, whether within only a year of this teaching he would make use of the dictum in a favorable sense in the "Senjutsu yurai."[21]

Whatever the true date of the "Senjutsu yurai," the fact remains that its evidence does not allow us to read into Dōgen's earliest meditation manual the teachings of the FKZZG. If, as the text informs us, he was asked to teach zazen after he returned from China, we can assume that Dōgen was looked upon, at least in some quarter, as knowledgeable in meditation. This would hardly be surprising, since he had just completed four years of training in Chinese monasteries. There was obviously much interest in the Sung Ch'an movement among Japanese Buddhists at this time, and anyone of Dōgen's background and social prominence would probably have been eagerly approached for information. Under the circumstances, he might well have "felt obliged" to compose a work on the zazen practice he had studied abroad. This work could easily have been simply a practical manual giving concrete instructions on meditation technique; it need not have shared the ornate literary character of the FKZZG nor its revolutionary political and doctrinal implications.

In regard to the question of the Karoku zazen-gi's relationship to the Tso-ch'an i we can, of course, only speculate. There is every reason to believe that Dōgen was familiar with Tsung-tse's work when he composed his first

manual. It was well known in China, and portions of its text had previously been used by Yōsai, founder of Kennin-ji and teacher of Dōgen's master Myōzen.[22] As we have noted, all four of Dōgen's extant works on meditation make use of the Tso-ch'an i, and it seems reasonable to suppose that the Karoku zazen-gi was no exception. We know that by 1233, when he wrote the Tenpuku manuscript, Dōgen had already begun to modify Tsung-tse's presentation of Zen practice, but whether he did so in his first zazen-gi is not clear. Particularly if the Karoku zazen-gi -- like the Tso-ch'an i and unlike the FKZZG -- was intended as a practical manual, he might well have been content simply to record the instructions of this most influential Ch'an meditation text.

We have considered the question of the missing Karoku zazen-gi at some length here simply in order to clarify the problems surrounding the traditional date of the composition of the FKZZG. Yet we should not lose sight of the fact that these problems have a significant effect on the broader issue of the nature of Dōgen's early teachings. The question of whether or not the text of the Tenpuku manuscript was originally composed in 1227 is of more than merely bibliographic interest; and if, as it appears, we are unable finally to answer that question, this in itself is significant, for it obliges us to reexamine what evidence we have concerning the first years of Dōgen's career immediately following his return to Japan. This is not the place to carry out such an examination, but it is perhaps worth noting here two areas

which would seem to require further study. One of these concerns the question of Dōgen's relationship to the established schools of Japanese Buddhism.

Sometime between 1229 and 1231 Dōgen apparently moved from the Rinzai monastery of Kennin-ji to his own quarters at Fukakusa.[23] This move represents a turning point in his early career, for it meant that henceforth he would make his own way as an independent Zen teacher. The reasons for the move have never been clear. Traditional biographies have often seen it as the result of Dōgen's disappointment with the spiritual conditions of his former monastery, but recently it has become fashionable to attribute the move to pressure from the Tendai headquarters at Enryaku-ji on Hiei-zan.[24] On this view, Dōgen, like Hōnen 法然 and Shinran 親鸞 before him, was persecuted and driven from the capital for spreading a popular new Buddhist movement which threatened the established religious powers. This movement was the Zen tradition proclaimed by the FKZZG.

There is little doubt that one of the major motivations for the composition of the FKZZG was Dōgen's concern for the establishment of an independent Zen practice. We have noted that this work represents a revision of Tsung-tse's meditation manual. Among the most obvious ways in which it differs from the Chinese text is in the disproportionate amount of space it devotes to a discussion of the Ch'an tradition; as we shall see, Dōgen's description of meditation practice is closely integrated with his advocacy of that tradition.

From a religious perspective, such integration may be seen as the expression of a characteristic feature of Dōgen's approach to zazen. At the same time, when it is viewed against its historical background, we can see Dōgen here attempting to assert a uniquely Zen form of meditation, not to be confused with the various kinds of meditation already practiced by the established schools of Japanese Buddhism.

This political aspect of the FKZZG has strongly influenced our perceptions of Dōgen's early teachings. On the assumption that the work was originally composed in 1227, it is widely held that immediately upon his return to Japan Dōgen sought to broadcast a new Buddhist teaching and to encourage the universal practice of Zen meditation. The Karoku zazen-gi is regarded as the opening move in his effort to establish his own Zen tradition in Japan and to spread that tradition among the Japanese Buddhist community. As such, its composition is often said to mark the founding of the Japanese Sōtō school. The work has been described as Dōgen's "declaration of independence" from the established Buddhist schools, and as what was in effect a "declaration of war" with the powerful Tendai organization on Hiei-zan. Its teachings so angered this organization, we are told, that Dōgen was driven from Kennin-ji by the monks of Enryaku-ji and was forced to take up residence in Fukakusa.[25]

In the light of the preceding discussion, this extravagant description of the Karoku zazen-gi must be considered highly speculative. Moreover, if we are not justified in

using the Tenpuku manuscript to determine the content of this work, we are left with no record at all of Dōgen's teachings prior to his departure from Kennin-ji and, therefore, no evidence that he was driven from this monastery because of his teachings.[26] It is possible, of course, that immediately upon reaching his native land he set about spreading a new Zen doctrine among the people. Indeed, in the Bendō-wa he describes the heavy burden of responsibility he felt after his return for "spreading the dharma and saving beings." (DZZ, 1, 729-30, 747.) Yet the same passage goes on to say that he had decided to await more favorable conditions before embarking on the dissemination of his message; and, in fact, we know of no other writings by Dōgen -- except the innocuous "Shari sōden ki" -- until the Bendō-wa itself in 1231. If we limit ourselves, therefore, to reliable contemporary sources, we simply do not know whether Dōgen returned from China as the outspoken advocate of a new religious tradition or whether his mission developed later as a result of experiences following his return.

A closely related -- and somewhat more pressing -- problem confronts us when we turn to a second issue affected by the questions surrounding the Karoku zazen-gi. This concerns the matter of Dōgen's relationship to the Sung Ch'an tradition. It has been maintained that the meditation manual he wrote immediately following his return from China represents, not only his declaration of independence from previous Japanese Buddhism, but the commencement of his

efforts to reform the Ch'an movement. According to this view, during his stay in China Dōgen became dissatisfied with the doctrines of the Lin-chi school prevalent there. After several years of study and travel he met the Ts'ao-tung master Ju-ching, who was himself bent on the reform of the contemporary Ch'an teachings. Ju-ching's efforts did not bear fruit in China itself, and he was soon forgotten in his own country; but the disciple Dōgen inherited his master's mantle and brought his work to fruition in Japan. The first step toward this end, we are told, was the composition of the Karoku zazen-gi.[27]

It is well known that Dōgen objected to many of the tendencies of Sung dynasty Ch'an. As we have already had occasion to mention, in the SBGZ bukkyō he rejects the notion of a special transmission outside the scriptures; elsewhere in the SBGZ he severely criticizes such characteristic features of the Sung school as the doctrine of the unity of Buddhism, Taoism, and Confucianism (san chiao i-chih 三教一致), the use of fixed doctrinal formulas such Tung-shan's 洞山 five ranks (wu i 五位) and Lin-chi's 臨濟 four classifications (ssu liao-chien 四料簡), the emphasis on the techniques of beating and shouting (pang ho 棒喝), and so on.[28] He was also, of course, dissatisfied with the understanding of meditation he found among the followers of the Lin-chi tradition. Of Dōgen's criticism of Sung meditation teachings we shall have a good deal more to say when we take up the content of the FKZZG; here we need only touch on the

problem as it relates to the historical question of the Karoku zazen-gi.

The Sōtō tradition has always maintained the view that its founder's understanding of Zen emerged full-blown from his enlightenment under Ju-ching. Consequently, it has felt obliged to emphasize Dōgen's fidelity to his master's teaching and to regard the entire corpus of his writings as a monolithic expression of his experience at T'ien-t'ung Shan; any suggestion of a gradual development in Dōgen's thought has generally been rejected as a misunderstanding of the nature of his message. Whatever religious truth may have been preserved in this view, it has brought the tradition into conflict with the findings of modern scholarship. For there is now a growing body of literature which indicates that Dōgen's teachings changed markedly during the course of his career.

The specifics of this literature need not detain us here, but it is important to note that one of its central topics concerns the question of Dōgen's relationship to Chinese Ch'an. In brief, it has been shown that when the texts of the SBGZ are read in chronological order, they reveal a dramatic shift in his attitude toward the Lin-chi school, a shift which led him around the year 1243 to launch a shrill, and often abusive, attack on both the teachings and the masters of that school. Though this development is considerably later than the period in question here, the fact of such a major change in Dōgen's thought serves as a warning that we must proceed with extreme caution in using his later

writings to infer his early attitude toward Chinese Ch'an. The question of the Karoku zazen-gi is clearly a case in point.[29]

In the absence of any record of his first teachings, it is by no means certain that Dōgen returned from China with a unique form of Zen different from that current in the Sung. As is now well known, there is little in the extant texts of Ju-ching's sayings to suggest that Dōgen's master was opposed to the dominant Lin-chi style of Ch'an, nor, indeed, that his teachings differed markedly from those of his contemporaries whom Dōgen singles out for criticism.[30] In Dōgen's own record of Ju-ching's words, the Hōkyō-ki, we do find passages which seem to presage the characteristic features of Dōgen's own Zen, but we cannot say how much of this document actually dates from the period it purports to record; for the Hōkyō-ki as we have it today represents a posthumous edition of Dōgen's notes put together by his disciple Ejō 懷奘 (1198-1280).[31] In sum, then, given our ignorance of the content of his first zazen-gi, there remains considerable doubt about just what Dōgen learned in China, and how much of his later attitude toward the Ch'an tradition was developed after his return to Japan.

NOTES

1. See Ōkubo Dōshū 大久保道舟, *Dōgen zenji goroku* 道元禅師語録, Iwanami bunko 岩波文庫, 2211-12 (Tokyo: Iwanami Shoten, 1940), p. 214. In 1925 Ōkubo reproduced the MS in collotype facsimile in his *Zen'en bokka* 禅苑墨華, vol. 1 (repr. Tokyo: Kokusho Kankōkai, 1974), and in 1930 the text was published in *SSZ*, *Shūgen* 宗源, 2, 11-12.

Much of the early work on the Tenpuku MS was done by Prof. Ōkubo. After publishing the text in the original edition of his *Dōgen zenji zenshū* 道元禅師全集 (1930; rev. and enl. ed. Tokyo: Shunjūsha, 1944), he brought out an annotated *kakikudashi* 書下 version and brief textual study in his *Dōgen zenji goroku*, pp. 7-15, 207-14. Slightly revised versions of this study subsequently appeared in his *Dōgen zenji den no kenkyū* 道元禅師伝の研究 (1953; rev. ed. Tokyo: Chikuma Shobō, 1966) and in the introduction to his new edition of *Dōgen zenji zenshū*, vol. 2 (Tokyo: Chikuma Shobō, 1970), pp. 519-22. This latter volume, pp. 3-5, reprints his edition of the text; a supplement, *Dōgen zenji shinpitsu shūsei* 道元禅師真筆集成, pp. 1-15, provides a copy of the MS.

The late Prof. Yokoi Kakudō 横井覚道 of Komazawa

University directed the production of a beautiful replica of the Tenpuku MS under the title *Fukusei kansu bon go-shinpitsu FKZZG* 復製巻子本御真筆普勧坐禅儀 (Fukui-ken: Dai Honzan Eihei-ji, 1969). More recently, a good reproduction has appeared in *Bokubi* 墨美 219 (3/1972). For some additional bibliography on the Tenpuku MS, see Sakurai Hideo 桜井秀雄, "*FKZZG* sankyū no shiryō ni tsuite" 普勧坐禅儀参究の資料について, *Sanshō* 傘松, 373 (Eihei-ji, 10/1974), pp. 32-47.

2. See Yokoi Kakudō, "*FKZZG* go-shinpitsu bon ni tsuite" 普勧坐禅儀御真筆本について, *SK*, 11 (3/1969), pp. 79-81.

3. The *Zazen yōjin-ki* 坐禅用心記 (*T*. 2586) contains several passages suggestive of influence from the Tenpuku text, but none of them appears conclusive.

4. Yokoi, "*FKZZG* go-shinpitsu bon ni tsuite," p. 79. For a discussion of the style of the calligraphy, see ibid., pp. 81-84. As might be expected, there is considerable difference of opinion on which of the many MSS attributed to Dōgen are authentic. Some of the more widely accepted have been reproduced in Ōkubo, *Dōgen zenji shinpitsu shūsei*, but Furuta Shōkin 古田紹欽 has recently questioned this selection. See his *SBGZ no kenkyū* 正法眼蔵の研究 (Tokyo: Sōbunsha, 1972), pp. 17-43. In this same paper (pp. 33-34) Furuta reaffirms the authenticity of the Tenpuku MS on the basis of its signature.

5. See "Uji Kannon-dōri-in sōdō kenritsu kanjin-sho"

宇治觀音導利院僧堂建立勧進疏 (*DZZ*, 2, 400-01). The Kannon-dōri-in was more formally known as Kannon-dōri-in Kōshō Hōrin-ji 觀音導利院興聖寶林寺 or more simply, as Kōshō-ji. It is thought to have been built on the site of an older monastery known as Gokuraku-ji 極樂寺 in the present Fushimi 伏見 ward of Kyoto. Dōgen apparently lived on or near the grounds of this monastery, at a place called An'yō-in 安養院, following his departure from Kennin-ji (for which, see below); he subsequently took over the entire complex. According to his "Kanjin-sho," the Gokuraku-ji complex included a Buddha hall (*butsuden* 佛殿) but lacked both a dharma hall (*hattō* 法堂) and monks' hall.

Early sources give the date of Dōgen's move to Kannon-dōri-in as 1233, and it is clear from the colophons of the *Maka-hannya-haramitta* and *FKZZG* that he was established in the monastery by this year. The question of the exact date is complicated by the colophon of the Shōbō-ji text of the *Bendō-wa* (to be discussed below), which indicates that Dōgen was already referring to his residence as Kannon-dōri-in in 1231. (See *DZZ*, 1, 763.)

6. The dates of the traditional Buddhist summer retreat (*varṣa*) differ according to the source. (For a summary discussion, see *Hōbōgirin* 法宝義林: *Dictionnaire encyclopédique du Bouddhisme*, fasc. 1, s.v. "ango.") It was the practice of the Chinese Ch'an school to keep the retreat from the sixteenth of the fourth month to the fifteenth of the seventh month, and we know that Dōgen followed this

tradition. (See his *SBGZ ango* 安居, *DZZ*, 1, 576, 580.)

7. According to his early biographers, Dōgen was supported in his establishment of Kōshō-ji by his powerful relative Guzei-in Jikan 弘誓院慈観, the former Fujiwara no Norie 藤原教家, who apparently later donated the altar (*hōza* 法座) for the *hattō*; he also received support from a nun named Shōkaku 正覚, thought to have been the wife of the third Kamakura Shōgun, Minamoto no Sanetomo (1193-1219); Shōkaku is said to have donated funds for the construction of the lecture hall. (See *Kenzei-ki* 建撕記, *SSZ*, *Shiden* 史伝, 2, 21; *Eihei-ji sanso gyōgō-ki* 永平寺三祖行業記, ibid., 1, 3.) We may note in passing here that the *SBGZ genjō kōan* 現成公案, a work written just after the *FKZZG*, was presented to a lay disciple from Kyūshū named Yō Kōshū 楊光秀. (See *DZZ*, 1, 10.)

8. These two sources will be discussed below. It should be noted that the MS of the "Senjutsu yurai" is in a very poor state of preservation and was already difficult to decipher in the eighteenth century when it was studied by the Sōtō scholar Menzan. The phrase in brackets in the translation here is illegible in the original; the words, "to compose a *zazen-gi*" (*sen zazen-gi* 撰坐禅儀), follow Menzan's interpolation. (See *DZZ*, 2, 6, note.) Given the context, there seems little reason to question his reconstruction.

9. See, e.g., Takeuchi Michio 竹内道雄, *Dōgen* 道元, Jinbutsu sōsho 人物叢書, 88 (Tokyo: Yoshikawa

Kōbunkan, 1962), pp. 183-85. The sources for, and theories regarding, the date of Dōgen's return have been discussed at some length in Ōkubo, Dōgen zenji den no kenkyū, pp. 174-90.

10. Kennin-ji, located in the present Higashiyama 東山 ward of Kyoto, was built by the second Kamakura Shōgun, Minamoto no Yoriie (1182-1204), and founded by Yōsai 栄西 (or Eisai; 1141-1215). Although Yōsai is generally regarded as the founder of Japanese Rinzai, he remained affiliated with the Tendai school, and during the period in question here Kennin-ji was under the jurisdiction of Enryaku-ji 延暦寺 on Hiei-zan 比叡山. According to the monastery's tradition, after Yōsai's death in 1215, the abbacy passed to his disciple Taikō Gyōyū 退耕行勇 (1163-1241).

Menzan's edition of the Kenzei-ki 建撕記 (SSZ, Shiden, 2, 16) states that Dōgen first visited Kennin-ji in 1214, while he was still studying on Hiei-zan. Ōkubo devotes an entire chapter to arguing for this date and for the tradition that Dōgen had an interview with Yōsai on this occasion (Dōgen zenji den no kenkyū, pp. 83-109); but as Kagamishima Genryū 鏡島元隆 has pointed out, the argument fails in the light of the early texts of the Kenzei-ki. (See his review of Kawamura Kōdō 河村孝道, Sho-hon taikō Eihei kaisan Dōgen zenji gyōjō Kenzei-ki 諸本対校永平開山道元禅師行状建撕記, Komazawa daigaku bukkyō gakubu ronshū 駒沢大学仏教学部論集, 6 [10/1975], pp. 143-44.) There is considerably better evidence to suggest that Dōgen visited the monastery in 1217, when he began to study under

Yōsai's disciple Myōzen (1184-1225). (See Ōkubo, *Dōgen zenji den no kenkyū*, pp. 85-89, 110.) In any case, neither of these dates will help us interpret the *Zuimon-ki* passage here.

11. See, e.g., Shibata Dōken 柴田道賢, *Zenji Dōgen no shisō* 禅師道元の思想 (Tokyo: Kōronsha, 1975), pp. 216-17. After Dōgen became Myōzen's disciple, the two monks traveled to China together in 1223. Myōzen died on T'ien-t'ung Shan in 1225. Nothing is known of Myōzen's disciple Chi.

12. This reading of the *Bendō-wa* passage is already suggested by the 1788 printing of the work, which gives the *furigana* for the words *honkyō* as *moto no sato*. (See *DZZ*, 1, 730, notes.)

In regard to the question of the location of Dōgen's disembarkation, early sources usually give it as Kawajiri 川尻 in Higo prefecture (modern Kumamoto), and most writers now follow Ōkubo in accepting this tradition. (See his *Dōgen zenji den no kenkyū*, pp. 180-83.)

13. Quoted in Ōkubo, *Dōgen zenji den no kenkyū*, p. 177. The full text may be found in *Zoku Gunsho ruiju* 続群書類従, Suppl. 2, 9a, 348. The *Hottō kokushi nenpu*, by Jinan Shōkun 自南聖薫, records events in the life of Shinchi Kakushin 心地覚心 (1207-98), traditionally regarded as the founder of the Fuke 普化 or Komu 虚無 school of Zen. Originally a student of Shingon, he took up the study of Zen at the Kongō-zanmai-in 金剛三昧院 on Kōya-san 高野山 under Yōsai's disciple Taikō Gyōyū. In 1242 he

took the Bodhisattva precepts (<u>bosatsu</u> <u>kai</u> 菩薩戒) from Dōgen at Kōshō-ji. (<u>Hottō Enmyō kokushi engi</u> 法燈圓明國師縁起, quoted in Ōkubo, <u>Dōgen zenji den no kenkyū</u>, p. 244; see also "Ju Kakushin kaimyaku"授覺心戒脈 , <u>DZZ</u>, 2, 291.) In 1249 he went to China, where he studied with the famous Lin-chi master Wu-men Hui-k'ai 無門慧開 (1183-1260). After his return to Japan in 1254, he became head monk (<u>dai-ichi</u> <u>za</u> 第一座) at Kongō-zanmai-in; and in 1264 he was asked to become the founding abbot (<u>kaizan</u> 開山) of Kōkoku-ji. This monastery subsequently became the headquarters of the Hottō 法燈 branch of the Rinzai school.

14. See Sugio Genyū 杉尾玄有 , "Minamoto no Sanetomo no nyū Sō kito to Dōgen zenji 源実朝の入宋企図と道元禅師, <u>SK</u>, 18 (3/1976), pp. 41-46. Sugio speculates that Sanetomo's followers saw in Dōgen's journey to China an opportunity to bring to fulfillment the Shōgun's own ill-fated plans for a trip to the Sung. We know that late in his brief life Sanetomo made preparations to sail to the continent; when these failed, he attempted to send his retainer Kagetomo, but the Shōgun's early death intervened. One of the reasons put forward for Sanetomo's interest in China was his desire to obtain plans for a Sung monastic complex (<u>garan</u> 伽藍), and in a recent article Moriya Shigeru 守屋茂 has speculated that it was in deference to this desire that his followers supported Dōgen's visit; he goes on to suggest that an extant copy of a plan for a Sung monastery (housed at Kōshō-ji and apparently based on a

work by Dōgen) may reflect the fruits of their support. (See "Fukakusa Kōshō-ji no kaiki Shōkaku Ni ni tsuite" 深草興聖寺の開基正覚尼について, IBK, 26, 1 [12/1977], pp. 55-60.) It should be noted in connection with this theory that Ganshō is also said to have approached Kakushin prior to the latter's departure for China in 1249 and requested that he inter Sanetomo's remains on Yen-tang Shan 雁蕩山. (See Mochizuki Shinkō 望月信亨, Bukkyō dai jiten 仏教大辞典, rev. ed., s.v. "Kōkoku-ji.")

The identification of Shōkaku with Sanetomo's wife, Nobuko 信子, has never been definitely established. According to the Azuma kagami 吾妻鏡, Nobuko took Buddhist vows (from Kakushin's teacher, Gyōyū) on the day after her husband's death; she then returned to Kyoto, where she established a monastery in memory of her husband. The Azuma kagami does not identify her Buddhist name, but in the Sanshū meiseki shi 三州名跡史 it is given as Honkaku 本覚. (See Ōkubo, Dōgen zenji den no kenkyū, pp. 208-11.) Ōkubo has suggested that Honkaku and Dōgen's patron, Shōkaku, are in fact the same individual (ibid.), but while his opinion is widely accepted, no one has succeeded in improving much on his rather tentative argument.

15. As Sugio himself is quick to point out, if we do not assume some prior connection with Sanetomo's followers, it is difficult indeed to explain why Dōgen, immediately upon his return from China, would be asked to participate in the dedication of Sanetomo's bodai-ji. One possible

answer, suggested in an interesting article by Harada Kōdō 原田弘道, is based on Dōgen's relationship with a certain Ryūzen 隆禅, a disciple of Yōsai, who was studying on T'ien-tung Shan while Dōgen was there. Harada speculates that this monk is the same Ryūzen who succeeded Gyōyū as abbot of Kongō-zanmai-in and later appointed Kakushin as head monk. (See "Nihon Sōtō-shū no rekishi-teki seikaku (2): Dōgen zenji to Ryūzen, Kakushin to no kōshō o megutte" 日本曹洞宗の歴史的性格(二)道元禅師と隆禅覚心との交渉を遶って, KDBGKK, 5 [12/1974), pp. 1-16].)

That Dōgen continued to maintain close relations with the Sanetomo clique is clear both from his association with Kakushin and from the fact that he later dedicated his monastery to the memory of the Shōgun. This latter fact is revealed in the text of a letter to his patron Hatano Yoshishige recorded in the Kenzei-ki. There Dōgen says that "this monastery" (tō ji 當寺) was built in memory of Sanetomo and Hōjō Masako (1156-1225; wife of Minamoto no Yoritomo and mother of Sanetomo). (DZZ, 2, 407.) Unfortunately, the letter is not clearly dated, and it seems impossible to determine to which monastery it refers. Most writers have followed Menzan in assuming it relates to Eihei-ji, but Moriya Shigeru has recently suggested that it refers to Kōshō-ji and should be dated around 1237. (See "Fukakusa Kōshō-ji no kaiki Shōkaku Ni ni tsuite," p. 59.)

16. See Furuta, SBGZ no kenkyū, p. 34. Although in modern times the Bendō-wa is commonly regarded as the first

text of the *SBGZ* (a position given it by the Eihei-ji edition), apparently it was never associated with this collection until the seventeenth century, when it was appended to Manzan's 89-*kan* and Kōzen's 95-*kan* redactions. (For a discussion of the various editions of the *SBGZ*, see Appendix A below.) The work seems to have been unknown to Edo scholars prior to the discovery of several texts late in the seventeenth century -- hence, the doubts regarding its authenticity. In the 1930s, however, Ōkubo Dōshū discovered a MS at the Shōbō-ji in Iwate prefecture, which bears a colophon dated 1515 and purports to be a copy of a 1332 MS. (See *DZZ*, 1, 763. For a discussion of this and other texts of the *Bendō-wa*, see Etō Sokuō 衛藤即応, *SBGZ josetsu: Bendō-wa gikai* 正法眼蔵序説弁道話義解 [Tokyo: Iwanami Shoten, 1959], pp. 29-37. Etō suggests [ibid., p. 35] that the Shōbō-ji text represents an earlier draft of the work, but this remains to be demonstrated.) While the Shōbō-ji text varies considerably from the popular version, the passage on the *FKZZG* is almost identical. This passage seems somewhat out of place in its context and may have been added as an afterthought, though this does not, of course, rule out the possibility that it was written by Dōgen himself. Furuta (loc. cit.) suggests that it was added by some later editor on the basis of the "Senjutsu yurai."

17. We may note in this regard the view of Nagahisa Toshio 永久俊雄, who doubts that Dōgen would have dated the colophon of his MS in Tenpuku if he had actually

composed it in Karoku. He points out that the verb sho 書, appearing in the colophon, is regularly used by Dōgen in the sense, "to compose" (rather than, "to copy") and should be understood in that sense here. Thus, he takes the colophon as evidence that the Tenpuku text was sufficiently different from the Karoku manual for Dōgen to have considered it a new composition. (See his "FKZZG no kenkyū 普勧坐禅儀の研究, SK, 5[4/1963], p. 11.)

18. The MS has been photocopied in Ōkubo, Dōgen zenji shinpitsu shūsei, p. 16, and described in ibid., p. 3. Unfortunately it lacks both title and colophon. Menzan assumed that it represents a postface to the FKZZG (see his FKZZG monge 普勧坐禅儀聞解, SSZ, Chūkai 註解, 3, 33); the title by which it is now usually cited was supplied by Ōkubo when he originally published the text in Zen'en bokka (see his Dōgen zenji den no kenkyu, p. 176). As we shall see, however, it is not entirely clear that the note was written as an explanation of the FKZZG.

19. See Ōkubo, Dōgen zenji goroku, pp. 208-09.

20. I.e., the Tenpuku and Kōroku versions of the FKZZG, the SBGZ zazen-gi, and the brief manual embedded in the Bendō-hō. The last three of these texts will be discussed in the following chapter.

21. For the dates of the SBGZ bukkyō, see DZZ, 1, 314; Dōgen's criticism of the notion of kyōge betsuden appears at pp. 306ff. Prof. Yanagida Seizan 柳田聖山 has also called my attention to the fact that the "Senjutsu yurai," in

emphasizing fidelity to the monastic code of Po-chang, reflects a sentiment appearing at the end of the Tenpuku FKZZG in the line, "Comply with the rule of Po-chang and everywhere communicate the news of Shao-lin." This line does not appear in either the Kōroku FKZZG or the SBGZ zazen-gi.

In opposition to the Tenpuku date, we have the opinion of Furuta Shōkin to the effect that the calligraphic style of the "Senjutsu yurai" is "more mature" than that of the Tenpuku MS. He suggests that it was written around 1243 as an explanation of the SBGZ zazen-gi. (See his SBGZ no kenkyū, p. 33.) Obviously, the question of the relative maturity of Dōgen's calligraphy must be left to the experts in such matters; but Prof. Furuta's suggestion is an interesting one, because it leads him to speculate that the Karoku text was in fact an early version of the SBGZ zazen-gi. In one sense, this is implausible, since, as we shall see in our discussion of this text, the manual in the SBGZ presupposes material much later than 1227. If, however, his suggestion is intended to indicate that the Karoku text, like the later SBGZ work, may have been simply a practical manual on the procedures of meditation, then -- as the reader will shortly discover -- it appears to be well taken.

22. See Kōzen gokoku ron 興禪護國論, T. 80 (2543), 12a, 14-27 As will be discussed below, Yōsai's text is apparently based only indirectly on Tsung-tse's manual. Although this work must be used with caution, we may note that in the Hōkyō-ki 寶慶記 Ju-ching is reported to have

recommended the *Tso-ch'an i* to Dōgen. (*DZZ*, 2, 386.)

23. The former date is provided by the *Tenzo kyōkun* (*DZZ*, 2, 300), in which, as we have seen, Dōgen states that he spent "two or three" years at Kennin-ji after his return to Japan; the latter date appears in the colophon of the "Shi Ryōnen dōsha hōgo" 示了然道者法語 (*DZZ*, 2, 162, notes), which was composed at An'yō-in in Fukakusa.

24. Dōgen's dissatisfaction with Kennin-ji is expressed in the *Zuimon-ki* (*DZZ*, 2, 461). The theory that Dōgen was forced from this monastery was first proposed by Ōkubo Dōshū. It is based on the evidence of a fragment of what appears to have been a letter written on the back of a MS of the *Hyōhan-ki* 兵範記 copied by Fujiwara no Teika 藤原定家 (1162-1241), which reports that the "mountain monks" (i.e., of Hiei-zan) were angry at Buppō-bō 佛法房 (i.e., Dōgen) and had decided to destroy his residence and drive him from the capital. (See Ōkubo, *Dōgen zenji den no kenkyū*, pp. 185ff.)

25. The notion that Dōgen sought to establish his own school through the composition of his first *zazen-gi* has been repeated by Dōgen scholars for many years: for a recent example, see Imaeda Aishin 今枝愛真, *Dōgen: Zazen hitosuji no shamon* 道元 坐禅ひとすじの沙門, NHK bukkusu, 225 (Tokyo: Nihon Hōsō Shuppan Kyōkai, 1976), pp. 74-75. For the view that the Karoku manual was the cause of Dōgen's conflict with Enryaku-ji, see, e.g., Imaeda, *Chūsei zenshū-shi no kenkyū* 中世禅宗史の研究 (Tokyo: Tōkyō Daigaku Shuppankai, 1970), pp. 19ff; Takasaki Jikidō 高崎

直道, "Mukyū no butsugyō" 無窮の仏行, in Takasaki and Umehara Takeshi 梅原猛, Kobutsu no manabi (Dōgen) 古仏のまなび道元, Bukkyō no shisō 仏教の思想, vol. 11 (Tokyo: Kadokawa Shoten, 1969), p. 59.

26. It must be remembered that the Hyōhan-ki fragment does not tell us whether the Hiei-zan monks actually carried out their intention to drive Dōgen from the capital nor why it was that they were angry at him. Moreover, since the fragment is undated, it is by no means certain that the letter dates from Dōgen's years at Kennin-ji rather than from his later Kōshō-ji period, when we know that he was under pressure from Hiei-zan. Ōkubo (Dōgen zenji den no kenkyū, pp. 188-89) believes that the reference to driving Dōgen from "the capital" (raku chū 洛中) must indicate the former date, but his argument for this is inconclusive. Moreover, even if we accept his opinion that the expression raku chū would not have been used in reference to Fukakusa at this time, we must recall that Dōgen continued to teach in Heian proper even after his move to the suburbs. Indeed, we know that in 1242-43, during the time that he was involved in his struggle with Hiei-zan and just prior to his sudden departure from Kōshō-ji, he gave a series of sermons in the Rokuhara 六波羅 district of the capital. (See the colophons of SBGZ zenki 全機, DZZ, 1, 205; SBGZ toki 都機, DZZ, 1, 209; SBGZ kobusshin 古佛心, DZZ, 1, 81.) It could very well be this activity in Heian that is alluded to in the letter. It may also be noted in this connection that, while

the letter refers to Dōgen as Buppō-bō, it is not entirely clear that he was known by this name during the time he was at Kennin-ji. (See Azuma Ryūshin 東隆眞, "Dōgen no gō to imina ni tsuite" 道元の号と諱について , *IBK*, 27, 1 [12/1978], p. 35.)

27. See Akishige Yoshiharu 秋重義治, "*FKZZG* kō" 考, *Tetsugaku nenpō* 哲学年報, 14 (1953), pp. 460-63. Akishige's characterization of the Karoku *zazen-gi* is based, of course, on the assumption that its content is preserved in the Tenpuku MS.

28. See, e.g., *SBGZ shizen biku* 四禅比丘, *DZZ*, 1, 707ff; *SBGZ bukkyō* 佛經, *DZZ*, 1, 408ff; *SBGZ sansui kyō* 山水經, *DZZ*, 1, 260-61.

29. Regarding Dōgen's attack on the Lin-chi school we shall have more to say below.

30. Other than Dōgen's own reports, our only sources for Ju-ching's teachings are several Japanese editions of his recorded sayings (*goroku* 語録) dating from the late seventeenth and early eighteenth centuries: see *Nyojō oshō goroku* 如浄和尚語録 (T. 2002A) and *Tendō-san Keitoku-ji Nyojō zenji zoku goroku* 天童山景德寺如浄禪師續語録 (T. 2002B). We know that a copy of Ju-ching's sayings was transmitted to Japan during Dōgen's lifetime and that in 1242 he gave a lecture on it (see *EHKR*, *DZZ*, 2, 26), but we cannot tell how closely the extant texts reflect the original. The relationship between the image of Ju-ching one gets from these texts and that presented by Dōgen has long troubled

Sōtō scholars. For a recent study of this problem, see Kagamishima Genryū, "Nyojō to Dōgen," in Kurebayashi Kōdō 榑林皓堂, ed., *Dōgen zen no shisō-teki kenkyū* 道元禅の思想的研究 (Tokyo: Shunjūsha, 1973), pp. 249-78. Kagamishima has supplemented this study in his "*Nyojō goroku* to *Hōkyō-ki*" 如浄語録と宝慶記, *Hōkyō-ki no sankyū* 宝慶記の参究, *Sanshō*, special number 50 (11/1975), pp. 77-83, in which he discusses some of the implications of a newly discovered MS of the *Nyojō goroku*.

31. See the latter's colophon, *DZZ*, 2, 388. The vulgate version of the *Hōkyō-ki* was first published in 1750 by Menzan; it is also extant in Ejō's own MS and several other early copies (*DZZ*, 2, 371-88), all of which differ considerably from Menzan's text. The work has recently been translated into English in James Kodera, "Dōgen's Formative Years in China: Historical Study and Annotated Translation of the *Hōkyō-ki*," (Ph.D. diss., Columbia University, 1976), 188-256.

It should be noted that the *Hōkyō-ki* contains several passages which seem to run counter to the spirit of Dōgen's teachings. Interestingly enough, Sōtō scholars have sometimes welcomed these passages as evidence for the early provenance of the work -- the argument being that they would not have survived later editing. Having thus established the authenticity of the *Hōkyō-ki*'s account of Ju-ching's teachings, they then ignore these doctrinally troublesome passages and emphasize those which agree with Dōgen's own views.

In connection with the question of the relationship between the *Nyojō goroku* and the *Hōkyō-ki*, we may note Yanagida Seizan's recent suggestion that it was precisely Dōgen's dissatisfaction with the teachings attributed to Ju-ching by the Chinese compilers of his sayings which spurred Dōgen, after his receipt of the book, to begin his attack on the Sung understanding of Ch'an. Prof. Yanagida implies (by describing it as Dōgen's *Tanni-shō* 歎異鈔) that the *Hōkyō-ki* was written, in part at least, in reaction to the *Nyojō goroku*. (See "Dōgen to Rinzai" 道元と臨済, *Risō* 理想, 513 [2/1976], pp. 81-83.)

THE TEXTS OF THE FUKAN ZAZEN-GI (II): THE KŌROKU TEXT AND THE SHŌBŌGENZŌ ZAZEN-GI

Despite its historical importance and the attention it has attracted from contemporary scholars, the Tenpuku text of the FKZZG seems to have had no impact on the history of the Sōtō school. Until its rediscovery in this century it apparently remained unstudied by the Sōtō masters; in its place another, and quite different, version of the FKZZG gained currency in the school. It is this version, usually referred to as the rufu 流布, or vulgate, text, which alone has been the subject of study and commentary by the tradition. The differences in content between the vulgate text and Tenpuku FKZZG will be discussed in detail below; in what follows here we shall limit ourselves to a consideration of questions arising from another sort of difference -- namely, that whereas the provenance of the Tenpuku text is clearly established from the manuscript itself, the origin and history of the vulgate text is highly problematic.

The existence of the Tenpuku manuscript seems clearly to indicate that Dōgen originally intended the FKZZG as an independent treatise on the theory and practice of meditation, and in modern times the essay is always treated as such. The fact is, however, that we have no early

manuscripts of the vulgate text of the FKZZG and, indeed, no definite evidence that it was ever transmitted as a separate work prior to the eighteenth century. The modern understanding of the FKZZG seems to originate with the important Sōtō master Menzan Zuihō 面山瑞方 (1683-1769), who dealt with the text as a separate essay in his influential commentary, the FKZZG monge.[1] Menzan's text was a version of the FKZZG included in the EHKR, edited by his teacher Manzan Dōhaku 卍山道白 (1635-1714). It is this version, referred to in the literature as the Kōroku text, which became the basis for all later printings. In order, therefore, to understand the popular text of the FKZZG as we know it today it is necessary to consider something of the nature and textual history of the work from which it was drawn.[2]

The EHKR is a work in ten rolls recording Dōgen's Zen teachings to his students. It is composed in Chinese, and its structure and content are clearly modeled on the kuang-lu 廣錄 texts of the great Sung masters. Of the ten rolls, seven are devoted to a record of Dōgen's lectures (jōdō 上堂) presented at Kōshō-ji (kan 1), Daibutsu-ji 大佛寺 (kan 2), and Eihei-ji (kan 3-7); the remaining three rolls record his informal teachings (shōsan 小參 and hōgo; kan 8), verse appreciations of Ch'an sayings (juko 頌古; kan 9), and poetry (geju 偈頌; kan 10). According to the colophons of these fascicles, the first was compiled by Senne 詮慧 (1198-1280), kan 2-4 by Ejō, 5-7 by Gien 義演 (d. 1314), kan 8 by Ejō and others, and kan 9 by Senne and others.[3]

It is not clear when and by whom the EHKR was put together. Presumably the final work was done shortly after Dōgen's death by his chief disciple and dharma heir, Ejō, and/or by the other disciples involved in the editing of the individual fascicles. Since, however, the material included in the compilation covers a period of almost two decades, it is quite possible -- indeed even probable -- that much of it was shown to Dōgen himself, and that, except perhaps for the very latest entries, it reflects his editing.[4] How much of the material in the present EHKR was originally included either by Dōgen or his disciples we cannot say. As we shall presently see, there are variant texts which suggest that more than one version of the work may have circulated from very early times.

All the extant texts of the EHKR include the FKZZG in *kan* 8. If we assume that the final editing was carried out after Dōgen's death, we cannot entirely rule out the possibility that the differences between the *Kōroku* and Tenpuku texts represent, at least in part, the work of Ejō and the other disciples to whom this fascicle is attributed. There is some reason to think, however, that this is not the case, and that the tradition is justified in attributing the popular version of the FKZZG to Dōgen himself. First, there is considerable doubt as to whether the FKZZG was actually included in the compilation of the EHKR worked on by Dōgen's disciples; second, and more importantly, there is internal evidence to suggest that the *Kōroku* FKZZG originally

belonged to a group of meditation texts composed by Dōgen during the last decade of his life. Let us, then, consider these two points in turn.

Manzan's edition of the EHKR, which subsequently became the standard popular version of this work, was first published in block print in 1673. According to the preface, the text is based on several manuscripts and corrects the various mistakes and corruptions which Manzan felt had crept into the EHKR during the course of its transmission.[5] Unfortunately, we do not know anything of Manzan's sources. The oldest extant manuscript of the EHKR dates only from the late sixteenth century; it is known as the Monkaku text, after the twentieth abbot of Eihei-ji, Monkaku 門鶴 (d. 1615), who had several of his disciples copy it out from some unidentified manuscripts in his possession. Monkaku's manuscript is dated 1598.[6]

The vulgate version of the EHKR shows considerable differences from the Monkaku text. Some are undoubtedly the result of Manzan's editing; yet the divergences are pronounced enough to suggest that there were at least two separate textual traditions of the EHKR. It has been suggested that both the Monkaku and Manzan traditions go back to the time of Dōgen, and that the former represents an earlier draft of the EHKR subsequently revised -- possibly by Dōgen himself -- in the latter.[7] Given the present state of our knowledge of the EHKR, this suggestion remains rather speculative; we cannot rule out the possibility that the

differences between the extant versions are the result of radical alterations in the texts during the course of their transmission. Indeed, it would appear that it is just such an alteration which accounts for the inclusion of the FKZZG in the EHKR.

In all versions of the EHKR the FKZZG appears at the end of kan 8 immediately following Dōgen's hōgo. On the surface this would seem to lend support to the view that both textual traditions originally included the treatise. In fact, however, such a view is not popular among students of the EHKR. Several arguments have been advanced against it. Ōkubo Dōshū has noted that the FKZZG does not accord with the general content of kan 8, which, as we have indicated, is devoted to shōsan and hōgo. This suggests to him that the FKZZG was added after the original compilation. He has also emphasized the fact that, whereas the FKZZG is followed by Dōgen's "Zazen-shin" 坐禅箴 (DZZ, 2, 166, notes) in the Manzan edition, this latter text does not appear in the Monkaku manuscript. This suggests that the content of kan 8 was not clearly fixed, and that the fascicle as we now have it may be the result of additions to an original core.[8] Itō Toshimitsu has further pointed out that in the Monkaku manuscript the words "end of hōgo" (hōgo shū 法語終) appear both before and after the text of the FKZZG. (DZZ, 2, 164, 166.) This suggests to him that kan 8 may once have ended with the hōgo, and that some copyist, confronted with the appended text of the FKZZG, inadvertently duplicated the

words originally intended to signal the end of the fascicle.[9]

Taken individually, it must be admitted that none of these arguments is particularly convincing. While the FKZZG may represent a break in the content of kan 8, this in itself does not indicate that it was added later. There was no precedent in the Chinese kuang-lu literature for the inclusion of a meditation manual, and if either Dōgen or his compilers wished to see the FKZZG included in the EHKR, they would have had no choice but to append it to one of the established categories of that literature. The argument from the "Zazen-shin" is also inconclusive: this text may simply have been dropped from the Monkaku tradition or added to the Manzan tradition because of its close connection with the FKZZG. In neither case does this tell us anything of the original status of the FKZZG. Finally, Itō's evidence might simply be dismissed as a copyist's error; alternatively, the second appearance of the words hōgo shū could be seen as an attempt to bring kan 8 into line with the other fascicles, all of which end with similar expressions. Here again, the evidence does not necessarily imply a reworking of the fascicle.

If these arguments do not entirely convince us, there would seem to be a stronger and more obvious case to be made against the original inclusion of the FKZZG. Whatever their individual merits, taken together the above arguments do cast doubt on the provenance of the present contents of kan 8. A comparison of the Manzan and Monkaku versions of this

fascicle reveals major divergences in both structure and wording throughout the text. And here we have a crucial point. For despite the many differences between the two traditions, their versions of the FKZZG are identical. This striking anomaly strongly suggests that the textual history of the FKZZG is different from that of the remainder of the fascicle. More specifically, it suggests that both traditions of the EHKR are relying on a single separate source for their text of the FKZZG. We know, in fact, that such a source was available; for the FKZZG also appears in an early work known as the Eihei Gen zenji goroku.

Although the oldest extant manuscripts of the EHKR are fully three and a half centuries after Dōgen's death, the antiquity of some text of the Kōroku is testified to by the early circulation of an abbreviated version of the work. This latter book is the Eihei Gen zenji goroku 永平元禅師語録, in one roll, commonly referred to as the Ryakuroku 略録, or abbreviated record. (SSZ, Shūgen, 2, 27-42.) Extant printings of the Ryakuroku date only from the mid-seventeenth century, but it was known to Manzan and quite possibly served as one of the sources for his edition of the EHKR.[10] According to the colophon, the book was originally printed in 1358 by the sixth abbot of Eihei-ji, Donki 曇希 (d.u.). It is mentioned in other early sources, and there seems no reason to doubt either the date of the original printing or the claim that the extant text is at least indirectly based on that printing.[11]

The origin of the Ryakuroku is explained in a postface to the work dating from 1264 and written by a Chinese monk named I-yüan 義遠 (d.u.), one of the disciples of Dōgen's master, Ju-ching.[12] According to this postface, Dōgen's disciple Giin 義伊 (1217-1300) took a copy of his teacher's Kōroku to China and asked I-yüan to edit the work.[13] The Eihei Gen zenji goroku, then, is apparently the result of I-yüan's editing. It amounts to only about one-tenth of the present EHKR and, moreover, shows many textual differences from both the Monkaku and Manzan versions. The reason for these differences is not clear; some may derive from I-yüan's editing or from later alterations in the text of the EHKR, but it is also quite possible that the Chinese editor worked with a version of the EHKR different from either of the known traditions.[14] In any case, what is most important for our purposes here is the fact that immediately following the hōgo selection, and just preceding the "Zazen-shin," the Ryakuroku contains a text of the FKZZG which is identical with the Kōroku version.

If, as seems likely, the Ryakuroku provided the source for the Kōroku FKZZG, it might well be asked whether the differences between the Tenpuku and popular versions are not the result of I-yüan's editing. In fact, this does not appear to be the case. Despite the evidence of his postface, there are indications in the Ryakuroku that I-yüan did not apply himself seriously to the editing of his fellow disciple's teachings. Indeed, there are passages within the Ryakuroku

FKZZG itself which could hardly have escaped the eye of a conscientious Chinese editor. More importantly, as we shall shortly see, all the major innovations of the Kōroku version of the FKZZG are closely related both in content and phrasing to passages occuring in Dōgen's Japanese SBGZ, a work obviously unknown to the Chinese. Hence, even if I-yüan did see the FKZZG -- and this is by no means certain -- there is little to suggest that he had a hand in its revision.[15]

The true story of the Kōroku FKZZG may never be known. A more precise understanding of its origin and early transmission can only be achieved in the light of a clear textual history of the EHKR. In the absence of a detailed analysis of the various redactions of that work, it remains unclear whether such a history can be established. For the present, we must restrict ourselves to the following tentative chronology based on the above discussion. (1) The Kōroku FKZZG was probably composed by Dōgen as an independent treatise. (2) It was probably not originally included in those compilations of the EHKR which have come down to us in the Monkaku and Manzan versions. (3) It was included in the Eihei Gen zenji goroku sometime prior to that work's publication in 1358, but we cannot say by whom this was done. Given our present knowledge, three possibilities seem most likely: (a) that the FKZZG was included in the version of the EHKR used by I-yüan, (b) that it was added to the Ryakuroku by Giin, or (c) that it was added by Donki at

the time of the printing of the Eihei Gen zenji goroku.[16] (4) Sometime between 1358 and 1598 the Ryakuroku text of the FKZZG was appended to the Monkaku (and possibly also the Manzan) tradition of the EHKR.[17] (5) With the publication of Menzan's FKZZG monge in the eighteenth century, the FKZZG was again separated from the EHKR and circulated as the independent work we know today.

If we are correct in the assumption that the authorship of the vulgate FKZZG is rightly attributed to Dōgen himself, then we can only conclude that he wrote two widely differing versions of the FKZZG -- one extant in the Tenpuku manuscript; the other, in the EHKR. This raises the question of the chronological relationship between the two versions. Unfortunately, the Kōroku text is undated, and it seems impossible to say precisely when it was composed. Nevertheless, internal evidence does allow us to narrow down the range of probabilities. First, and most importantly, a comparison of the two versions of the FKZZG clearly reveals that the Kōroku text represents a revision of the Tenpuku work. The exact nature of this revision will be discussed below; here it is sufficient to note that it establishes that the Kōroku FKZZG was composed sometime in the twenty years between 1233 and Dōgen's death in 1253. Second, we have several dated texts from this period which are closely related both in content and phrasing to the Kōroku version and which give us grounds for placing the FKZZG in the period between 1242 and 1246. Let us, then, turn our

attention to these related texts.

In the eighth month of 1233, immediately following his composition of the Tenpuku FKZZG, Dōgen wrote his famous Genjō kōan, the work which was to become the first fascicle of the Japanese SBGZ. It was probably early in 1234 that he produced the Gakudō yōjin shū 學道用心集, a treatise on Buddhist practice which draws heavily on the ideas and the phrasing of the Tenpuku FKZZG.[18] During the subsequent years Dōgen's community at Kōshō-ji seems to have flourished, and his reputation to have grown. In the winter of 1234 his future dharma descendent, Ejō, seems to have begun regularly to attend his lectures and to take down the notes which were to become the SBGZ zuimon-ki.[19] In 1235, as we have seen, Dōgen solicited contributions for the construction of a monks' hall at Kōshō-ji and in the following year held the formal opening of his monastery. Thereafter, his attention seems to have turned for a time to the regulation of his growing community, and over the next three years he composed a series of works emphasizing monastic practices.[20]

In 1235 Dōgen had apparently compiled his Chinese SBGZ, a collection of 300 Zen cases, many of which were to become the subject of his subsequent lectures and writings.[21] In 1240 work was begun in earnest on the texts which were to form the Japanese SBGZ, and during the next four to five years Dōgen wrote at an ever-increasing pace, producing the great majority of the fascicles of this famous collection.[22] Both the quantity and the quality of Dōgen's

writing at this time is all the more remarkable when one recalls that it was during this period that he suddenly abandoned his monastery at Uji and withdrew to the isolated mountain province of Echizen. In the months just prior to this move, and especially in early 1242, he wrote several important fascicles on the nature of Zen practice and enlightenment; among these was the SBGZ zazen-shin.[23]

We have already had occasion to note that a text known as the "Zazen-shin" appears in both the Ryakuroku and the Manzan edition of the EHKR. This is a brief verse in Chinese based on a similar work by the famed Sung dynasty Ts'ao-tung master Hung-chih 宏智 (1091-1157).[24] As we have seen, the "Zazen-shin" is missing from the Monkaku manuscript, and it may well be that, like the FKZZG, it was not included in the original compilation of the EHKR. In any case, this same verse, together with Hung-chih's verse, forms the conclusion of the Zazen-shin text of the SBGZ. In this fascicle, as in most of the SBGZ, Dōgen presents his views in the form of Japanese commentary on several passages from the Chinese Ch'an literature -- in this case, passages dealing with the meaning and goal of meditation practice. These views will be an important source for us when we take up the question of Dōgen's theoretical interpretation of zazen.

The Zazen-shin appears as kan 12 in the early manuscripts of the 75-kan SBGZ tradition.[25] In addition, it is preserved in an ancient manuscript housed at Kōfuku-ji 廣福寺 in Kumamoto prefecture. This latter manuscript,

though undated, indicates that the work was composed at Kōshō-ji. Although other early manuscripts do not provide us with more information, the Honzan edition of the SBGZ includes a colophon for the Zazen-shin which states that it was composed at Kōshō-ji on the eighteenth day of the third month (April 19) of 1242.[26]

No one familiar with the Kōroku text of the FKZZG can read the SBGZ zazen-shin without immediately noting the close relationship between the two. Moreover, if one then compares these two texts with the Tenpuku FKZZG, it becomes obvious that the major innovations in the Kōroku version occur precisely in those passages which most closely parallel the teachings of the Zazen-shin. Such a comparison has in fact been carefully worked out by Akishige Yoshiharu, and there is no need for us to repeat it here. In brief, his argument begins by isolating five key passages in which the Tenpuku and Kōroku texts of the FKZZG clearly differ; he then proceeds to show that in each of these passages the Kōroku version is relying on one of the five major sections into which the Zazen-shin can be divided. From this he concludes that the Kōroku work represents Dōgen's own revision of the FKZZG, based on the text of the SBGZ zazen-shin.[27]

Akishige's argument was originally intended to refute the suggestion that the Kōroku text might have been the result of I-yüan's editing.[28] While we may not wish to accept all the details of his argument, clearly he has

succeeded in this intention -- though it must be admitted he has not entirely eliminated the possibility that one of Dōgen's followers might have used the Zazen-shin to edit the FKZZG. In any case, his argument establishes that the Kōroku FKZZG should be dated after the third month of 1242, when the Zazen-shin was composed. Akishige himself suggests a date around the end of 1243. He does this on the basis of the SBGZ zazen-gi, another of Dōgen's meditation texts closely related to both the Zazen-shin and the Kōroku FKZZG.

According to the colophon of the Honzan edition of the Zazen-shin (DZZ, 1, 101), Dōgen presented this work as a lecture (jishu 示衆) in the eleventh month of the first year of Kangen 寛元 (December 1243-January 1244) at Yoshimine-shōja 吉峰精舎 in Echizen. It is fairly certain that Dōgen moved from Kōshō-ji to Echizen during the seventh month of 1243. For the next year, prior to the establishment of Daibutsu-ji, he apparently divided his time between Yoshimine-dera and a neighboring monastery known as Yamashibu 禅師峰.[29] Despite his lack of a fixed residence during this period, Dōgen continued to work intensively on his SBGZ commentaries. Indeed, this year marked the highpoint in his production of these texts and saw the completion of more than two dozen fascicles, or roughly one-third of the entire collection.[30] It was during the course of this year that Dōgen apparently delivered a lecture on the practice of zazen entitled SBGZ zazen-gi. This work, often known as the wabun 和文, or Japanese, zazen-gi, appears as kan 11 in

early manuscripts of both the 60- and 75-kan SBGZ. According to the colophon, like the Zazen-shin, it was delivered at Yoshimine-shōja and dates from the eleventh month of 1243.[31]

The SBGZ zazen-gi essentially represents a Japanese version of the material contained in the central section of the FKZZG -- that dealing with the actual technique of zazen practice. Thus, it omits the lengthy and elegant discussion of the meaning of Zen meditation which occupies such a prominent place in the FKZZG. At the same time, it adds several concrete details regarding the preparation for, and practice of, zazen. We shall consider some of these details in due course; here what is important to note is that those passages which do parallel the FKZZG are much closer to the Kōroku version than to the Tenpuku manuscript. Indeed, so exact is the correspondence in certain crucial phrases that there can be no doubt that one of the texts is relying on the other.[32]

On the basis of the close relationship between these two works, Akishige concludes his discussion of the composition of the Kōroku text by suggesting (p. 479) that Dōgen edited the FKZZG "around the time" that he wrote his Japanese manual. In the end, prudence may dictate that we content ourselves with this somewhat vague suggestion; yet one cannot but wish for some solution to the question of the relative chronology of these works. For if it can be established that the Japanese zazen-gi is derived from the Kōroku text,

this would lay to rest once and for all any lingering doubts regarding Dōgen's authorship of the work. In fact, there does seem to be some internal evidence to suggest that the Japanese version was written on the basis of the Kōroku text and not vice versa.

We have seen that the Kōroku FKZZG and SBGZ zazen-gi share certain key passages not contained in the Tenpuku manuscript. In some of these the Japanese closely parallels the Chinese text; in others, however, the two versions diverge. Careful comparison of these divergences leaves one with the distinct impression that in each case the Japanese text represents a refinement of the passage in question. Moreover, there are also cases in which the Japanese zazen-gi has modified passages shared by the two versions of the FKZZG. Both these features suggest that the SBGZ zazen-gi is further from the Tenpuku version, and that it represents an elaboration of the revisions made in that version by the Kōroku text. This would imply, of course, that the Kōroku FKZZG preceded the Japanese work and would allow us to place its composition sometime between the Zazen-shin and the SBGZ zazen-gi.[33]

Let us hasten to admit that this argument for the relative dates of the two manuals is quite subjective. The passages in question are few, and their evaluation is complicated by the differences inherent in the syntax of Chinese and Japanese. In the end, the reader must examine the texts for himself and decide whether the evidence justifies the

conclusion. Whether or not it does, we must point out that there still remains some doubt about the absolute date of the FKZZG. For the SBGZ manual is a rather more problematic text than has hitherto been recognized, and both its dating and its relationship to the FKZZG are open to question.

It is generally agreed that the SBGZ zazen-gi represents a translation of the central section of Dōgen's Chinese manual. Indeed, we have ourselves been at pains here to emphasize the close connection between the two. Whatever the truth of their chronological relationship, both the Japanese manual and the Kōroku FKZZG can be seen as reworkings, under the influence of the Zazen-shin, of the material in the earlier Tenpuku text. Yet having said this, we cannot, as is usually done, simply write off the SBGZ work as a Japanese abbreviation of the FKZZG. For to do so is to ignore the fact that a considerable portion of this brief text contains material not found in either the Tenpuku or Kōroku manuals. For the most part, the effect of this material -- together with the omission of the long introductory and concluding sections of the FKZZG -- is to produce a work quite different in its intention from the two Chinese texts. It is a work much less concerned with justifying and promoting Zen meditation than with describing the specific procedures for its actual practice. In this, it is closer in spirit to Dōgen's Bendō-hō 辨道法, than it is to the FKZZG.

We have noted above that, the colophon of the SBGZ zazen-gi indicates that this work was "taught to the assembly"

(_jishu_) in the eleventh month of 1243 at Yoshimine-shōja. This colophon appears on the 75-kan Kenkon-in 乾坤院 and 84-kan Gyokuun-ji 玉雲寺 manuscripts. It does not occur in the 60-kan Dōun-ji 洞雲寺 text; and this is somewhat surprising, for the manuscripts of this SBGZ almost always supply very good information on the date and place of composition. More surprising is the fact that in the Rurikō-ji 瑠璃光寺 and several other manuscripts of the SBGZ, the Zazen-gi is associated with Daibutsu-ji, the monastery to which Dōgen moved after his stay at Yoshimine-dera.[34] In terms of textual history, we are not obliged to give preference to the evidence of this text over that of the equally ancient Kenkon-in manuscript, and it may be that the Rurikō-ji reference is simply a mistake. Still, its existence does raise a question about the dating of the SBGZ zazen-gi and, hence, of the FKZZG.

According to the Kenzei-ki, work on the dharma hall of Daibutsu-ji was begun on the nineteenth day of the second month (March 29) of 1244, and on the eighteenth of the seventh month (August 22) Dōgen is said to have moved from Yoshimine-dera to take up residence. The ceremony opening the hattō was held on the first day of the ninth month (October 4), and on the third day of the eleventh month (December 4) the ridgepole ceremony (jōtō shiki 上棟式) for the monks' hall (sōdō) was performed. The first meditation retreat (ango) in this hall was held during the following summer. One year later, on the fifteenth of the sixth month (July 29) of

1246, the name of the monastery was changed from Daibutsu-ji to Eihei-ji. If we can trust this chronology, then, Dōgen's Daibutsu-ji period covered two years, from the autumn of 1244 to the summer of 1246.[35]

With his move to Daibutsu-ji, perhaps because of a preoccupation with the opening of his new monastery, Dōgen's production of SBGZ texts declined markedly, and many of those that he did write from this time on were concerned largely with cultic matters. Around this same time he began to compose the series of works in Chinese on monastic rules and practices now known as the Eihei shingi 永平清規. Of these, one -- the Bendō-hō -- was apparently written at Daibutsu-ji.[36] Like most of the works in the Eihei shingi, we have no early manuscripts of the Bendō-hō and, hence, are dependent solely on the Edo printings for our knowledge of the text. These printings identify the place of composition as Daibutsu-ji but, unfortunately, do not provide us with a date for the work. Since the Bendō-hō is concerned with the form of practice in the meditation hall, it is possible to speculate that it was written during the first half of 1245, when the monks began to use the new sōdō at Daibutsu-ji.[37]

It has been pointed out that there were three times in his life when Dōgen wrote on zazen practice: once immediately after his return from China, again upon establishing Kōshō-ji, and a third time shortly after his arrival in Echizen.[38] Whether or not this is true, it is not the whole truth, for it overlooks the fact that following the opening

of his own monastery in Echizen Dōgen once again turned his attention to the description of zazen. Unlike the zazen-gi texts we have been considering here, the Bendō-hō is concerned less with meditation itself than with correct deportment in the meditation hall. It gives detailed instructions on how the monks are to sit, sleep, and move about in the hall, how they are to care for their robes and bedding, how they are to wash themselves, brush their teeth, and so on. Toward the end of these instructions, under the heading "Zazen-hō" 坐禅法, or method of zazen, Dōgen includes a section providing a brief description of the practice of meditation. (DZZ, 2, 317-18.)

The discussion of zazen in the Bendō-hō has much in common with that of the SBGZ zazen-gi. Like the Japanese manual, it is closely related to the central portion of the Kōroku FKZZG and includes material developed in the Zazen-shin. Also like the SBGZ manual, it contains passages not found in either version of the FKZZG. While some of these have no precedent in Dōgen's various zazen-gi, several others correspond to innovations in the Japanese text. This correspondence suggests that there is a close connection between the composition of the SBGZ zazen-gi and that of the zazen section of Bendō-hō.[39]

Given the brevity of the texts and the consequent dearth of examples, it appears impossible to establish the relative chronology of these two works on the basis of internal evidence. If we accept the colophon of the Kenkon-in

manuscript, obviously we must assume that the Bendō-hō was written under the influence of the Japanese zazen-gi. Still, in light of the evidence of the Rurikō-ji manuscript and the close internal connection between the two texts, it is not impossible to speculate that the SBGZ manual was written with reference to, and as an amplification of, the "Zazen-hō" section of the Bendō-hō. It is also quite possible that the information of both our manuscripts is correct, and that like many other texts in the SBGZ, Dōgen presented his zazen-gi more than once: first at Yoshimine-dera in 1243 and then again at Daibutsu-ji, presumably around the time he composed the Bendō-hō. Under the circumstances, therefore, it would seem somewhat precipitate to accept without reservation the 1243 date for this work. Such reservation would imply, of course, that Akishige's date for the FKZZG is also less certain than it at first appeared, and that the possibility remains open that the Kōroku text was not written until after Dōgen's move to Daibutsu-ji.[40]

Before leaving the subject of the Bendō-hō, we must call attention to one other feature of this work which not only bears indirectly on the dating of the FKZZG but also throws some light on the background of the Japanese zazen-gi. We have noted that the "Zazen-hō" section includes several passages not found in any of the zazen-gi texts. Interestingly enough, a comparison of these passages with Tsung-tse's Tso-ch'an i reveals that some of them are taken from this Chinese work.[41] The reader may be excused if he

finds a bit odd the notion that in 1245 Dōgen was still relying on Tsung-tse's manual for his meditation teaching. After all, we have previously seen that the FKZZG was written to improve on the Tso-ch'an i, and that Dōgen explicitly rejected this work in his so-called "FKZZG senjutsu yurai." From another perspective, however, its influence on the Bendō-hō is not surprising. We may recall that the Chinese manual was part of the Ch'an-yüan ch'ing-kuei, a work devoted to the Ch'an monastic code. Despite Dōgen's dissatisfaction with its meditation section, he continued to make use of this book for his own descriptions of monastic practices, and throughout the texts of the Eihei shingi he often cites it by name.[42] Hence, we know that Dōgen was regularly referring to Tsung-tse at the time that he wrote his description of sōdō practices, and it is by no means improbable that he would have consulted its Tso-ch'an i in his presentation of zazen.

The fact that Dōgen was reading the Tso-ch'an i during this period may help to explain why he returned to his earlier revision of that work and decided to rewrite the FKZZG. It also suggests one possible explanation for why his Japanese zazen-gi found its way into the SBGZ. As we have noted, almost every text in this collection draws heavily on the Chinese canon and develops its thesis in the form of commentary on passages from the literature of the Ch'an tradition.[43] The question naturally arises, then, why the Zazen-gi, which is almost unique in its departure

from this format, was grouped with these commentaries. We have seen that many of the SBGZ texts from this period are concerned with monastic practice, and several of them quote material from the Ch'an-yüan ch'ing-kuei. The SBGZ zazen-gi, while not a commentary on the Tso-ch'an i, does appear in several passages to reflect its text; and it is possible to speculate that the Japanese manual originated, not merely as a result of Dōgen's editing of the FKZZG, but as an integral part of his teachings on the Ch'an-yüan ch'ing-kuei.

Whatever the ultimate value of such speculation, our discussion has clearly indicated the central importance of Tsung-tse's Tso-ch'an i for an understanding of Dōgen's meditation texts. Japanese Sōtō scholars have long recognized that Dōgen made use of this work in his composition of the FKZZG. In their haste, however, to establish Dōgen's superiority to the Chinese Ch'an tradition they have been somewhat too eager to emphasize his revisions of Tsung-tse's manual and to ignore its obvious and continuing influence on his presentation of zazen practice. Certainly the innovations of the FKZZG are important, but we shall not be able to properly evaluate their importance without a clear understanding of the teachings on which they are based. It is to these teachings, then, and to Dōgen's interpretation of them that we now turn our attention.

NOTES

1. SSZ, Chūkai, 3, pp. 1-33. This commentary was first published in 1757.

2. For Manzan's edition of the EHKR, see SSZ, Shūgen, 2, pp. 43-146. We may note in passing that other sections of the EHKR have similarly circulated as separate texts. In addition to the "Zazen-shin" (of which, more below), we have early MSS of some of the poetry and hōgo 法語 (e.g., the "Shi Ryōnen dōsha hōgo" [DZZ, 2, 161-62]). In later times we have the examples of the Eihei Gen oshō juko 永平元和尚頌古 (T. 2583), dating from 1827, and Menzan's selected passages, the Eihei kakun 永平家訓 (Zoku SSZ, Hōgo 法語, 9, pp. 369-409), published in 1739.

3. For an analysis of the contents of the EHKR, see Itō Toshimitsu 伊藤俊光, ed., Eihei kōroku chūkai zensho 永平広録註解全書, vol. 1 (Tokyo: Eihei Kōroku Chūkai Zensho Kankōkai, 1961), pp. 6-9.

4. The latest dated lecture is from the winter of 1252, when Dōgen was apparently already suffering from his final illness. He died several months later in the autumn of 1253.

5. SSZ, Shūgen, 2, 43. Some sources mistakenly give the date of publication as 1672, but see Itō, EHKR chūkai

zensho, vol. 1, p. 15.

6. Also known as the Sosan 祖山 text. Parts of the MS were rediscovered in the 1920s at Eihei-ji by Kishizawa Ian 岸沢惟安, and the entire text was later edited by Noiri Kōjun 野入考純. It has been reprinted in *DZZ*, 2, 7-200, with textual notes to the Manzan edition. A closely related MS, known as the Rinnō-ji 輪王寺 text, appears to be derived from the Monkaku text. According to the catalogue of the Rinnō-ji library, this MS also dates from 1598, but Itō suggests that it was copied after the publication of Manzan's edition. (See his "Rinnō-ji Tenkai zō shahon *EHKR* ni tsuite" 輪王寺天海蔵写本永平広録について, *SK*, 4 [3/1962], pp. 31-36.) Nagahisa Gakusui 永久岳水 reports on still another version of the *EHKR*, housed at Kōshō-ji, which differs from both the Manzan and Monkaku traditions; unfortunately, he does not give any information on the contents or date of this text. (See "*EHKR* no kenkyū" 永平広録の研究, *SK*, 15 [3/1973], pp. 4-5.)

7. See, e.g., Itō, *EHKR chūkai zensho*, p. 10; Kagamishima Genryū, "*EHKR* to *Ryakuroku*" 永平広録と略録, *Komazawa daigaku kenkyū kiyō* 駒沢大学研究紀要, 15 (3/1957), p. 64.

8. *Dōgen zenji goroku*, pp. 213-14; *Dōgen zenji den no kenkyū*, pp. 303-04. It should be noted that the Rinnō-ji text also lacks the "Zazen-shin."

9. *EHKR chūkai zensho*, vol. 3, p. 196, notes.

10. The earliest extant text, commonly known as the

Shōhō 正保 printing, dates from around 1644. It is thought to be based on earlier printings from ca. 1600. (For a discussion of the history of the publications of this work, see Ōkubo, Dōgen zenji goroku, pp. 224-26.) Manzan refers to the Ryakuroku in his preface to the EHKR (SSZ, Shūgen, 2, 43); moreover, his edition includes the original postfaces of the Ryakuroku (ibid.), texts not included in the Monkaku or Rinnō-ji MSS. Several scholars have noted that Manzan's text of the EHKR is closer to that of the Ryakuroku than is the Monkaku MS, and it has been suggested that he relied on the abbreviated record in his editing of the work. (See Kagamishima, "EHKR to Ryakuroku," pp. 55ff.)

11. For the date of printing, see SSZ, Shūgen, 2, 41. Donki was a disciple of the important fifth abbot of Eihei-ji, Giun 義雲 (1253-1333), known for his work on the SBGZ. In addition to bringing out the Ryakuroku, Donki was also responsible for the publication of Dōgen's Gakudō yōjin-shū (for which, see below) and his own master's Giun oshō goroku 義雲和尚語録 (T. 2591). These two works, published in 1357, represent the earliest printed books of the Sōtō school. Early sources give Donki's date of death as 1350 or 1352, but presumably he was still alive in 1358 when the Ryakuroku appeared. Kagamishima calls attention to the fact that Donki's text of the Ryakuroku is discussed in kan 2 of the Untō-shō 雲桃鈔, a fifteenth century work by Unshō Ikkei 雲章一慶 (1386-1459). (See "EHKR to Ryakuroku," pp. 56ff.)

12. SSZ, Shūgen, 2, 42. The date is inferred from I-yüan's preface (ibid., 27). Wu-wai無外 I-yüan does not appear in any of the standard Ch'an histories, but he is given as one of the compilers of the Nyojō oshō goroku (T. 48, 128b) and of the Zoku goroku (ibid., 134a).

13. Kangan寒巖 Giin, said to have been the son of Emperor Gotoba (r. 1183-98), originally studied Tendai on Hiei-zan. He later became a disciple of Ekan懷鑑(d. 1251) of the Nihon Daruma 日本達磨 school, with whom he joined Dōgen's followers in 1241. In 1253 he made a brief visit to China but returned immediately following Dōgen's death to become a disciple of Ejō. In 1264 he visited China again, this time for a stay of three years. In addition to seeing I-yüan, he took Dōgen's Kōroku to Tui-keng Te-ning退耕德寧 (d.u.) and Hsü-t'ang Chih-yü 虛堂智愚 (1185-1269), two prominent masters of the Yang-ch'i line of Lin-chi; from both men he received brief laudatory postfaces for the work. (See SSZ, Shūgen, 2, 42.) Following his return to Japan in 1267, Giin was active in Kyūshū, where he founded several temples, including Daiji-ji 大慈寺 in Kawashiri. He was supported by the former emperor Kameyama (r. 1259-74), and his school (known as the Kangan 寒巖 or Hōō 法王 sect) appears to have flourished. Some early sources state that he received transmission directly from Dōgen, but Ōkubo has devoted a long article to showing that he was heir to Ejō's dharma. (See Dōgen zenji den no kenkyū, pp. 447-68.)

14. This is the view of Kagamishima Genryū, who points

out that the _Ryakuroku_ contains five _jōdō_ not included in any extant version of the _Kōroku_. (See his "_EHKR_ to _Ryakuroku_," p. 60.) The view is rejected by Itō in _EHKR chūkai zensho_, vol. 1, p. 12.

15. The possibility that the _Kōroku_ _FKZZG_ was edited by I-yüan was first suggested by Ōkubo Dōshū in his _Dōgen zenji goroku_, p. 223. This suggestion was subsequently discredited, and in later works Ōkubo dropped it and chose to assert that Dōgen had edited the text himself. (See his _Dōgen zenji den no kenkyū_, p. 304.) The question of the extent to which I-yüan actually worked over the text of the _EHKR_ is the subject of disagreement. Although his postface says that he was asked by Giin to "compare and correct" (_kōsei_ 較正) the work, Manzan suggests that he simply selected passages to form the _Ryakuroku_, without making substantial changes in the text. Kagamishima has pointed out an obvious mistake in I-yüan's text, which suggests that he did not go over the work carefully. (See his "_EHKR_ to _Ryakuroku_," p. 62.)

16. (A) is not widely defended, but if we accept the possibility that I-yüan worked with a text different from either of the extant traditions, it should be given serious consideration. (B) was the suggestion of Ōkubo, who speculated that Giin might have taken a copy of the Tenpuku _FKZZG_ to China, received I-yüan's corrections, and then included it in the _Ryakuroku_. (_Dōgen zenji goroku_, p. 223.) If we dismiss -- as Ōkubo himself later did -- the

possibility of I-yüan's editing of the FKZZG, this view would seem to have little to recommend it. (C) was early proposed by Unshō Ikkei in his Untō-shō (cited in Kagamishima, "EHKR to Ryakuroku," p. 57); it is supported by Itō Toshimitsu at EHKR chūkai zensho, p. 15.

17. Itō (EHKR chūkai zensho, p. 15) assumes that it was Manzan himself who, following the lead of the Ryakuroku, added the FKZZG to his version of the EHKR. Since, however, the FKZZG had already found its way into the Monkaku tradition, we ought not rule out the possibility that it was also included in one or more of the texts with which Manzan worked.

18. The origin of this work is unclear. Menzan and many later scholars consider it a compilation of Dōgen's teachings over an extended period probably made by his disciple Ejō. Ōkubo, on the other hand, argues that it was composed as a unified treatise by Dōgen himself. (See his Dōgen zenji den no kenkyū, pp. 305-09.) While the final date of composition remains uncertain, two of the chapters of the work bear colophons dated in 1234. Several close parallels with the Tenpuku FKZZG also strongly suggest that the two works were written about the same time.

19. According to the colophon of this work (DZZ, 2, 495), it represents an edition of Ejō's notes taken during the Katei 嘉禎 era (1235-37) and compiled by some follower after his death. Despite the evidence of the colophon and the wide acceptance of the Zuimon-ki as an authentic record of Dōgen's early teachings, Imaeda Aishin, on the basis of

its content, rejects the work as a later product of the Hōkyō-ji 寶慶寺 line of Ejō's disciples. (See his Dōgen: Zazen hitosuji no shamon, pp. 177-83. Imaeda's argument has recently been criticized by Itō Shūken 伊藤秀憲 in "SBGZ to SBGZ zuimon-ki to no aida no mujun" 正法眼蔵と正法眼蔵随聞記との間の矛盾, IBK, 27, 1 [12/1978], pp. 343-46.)

According to the early biographies of Ejō, he visited Dōgen first while the latter was still at Kennin-ji and then again in the winter of the first year of Bunreki 文暦 (1234), when Dōgen was residing in Fukakusa. (See Eihei-ji sanso gyōgō-ki, SSZ, Shiden, 1, 4; Denkō-roku 傳光録, ibid., Shūgen, 2, 398.)

20. In the spring of 1237 Dōgen wrote the Tenzo kyōkun (DZZ, 2, 295-303), a work on the correct practice of the monastery cook (tenzo). Also in 1237 was written the Shukke ryaku-sahō 出家略作法 (DZZ, 2, 272-78; also known as the Tokudō 得道 ryaku-sahō), on the ceremony of going forth (pravrajya) into the Buddhist order. In 1239 Dōgen wrote the Juundō-shiki 重雲堂式 (DZZ, 2, 304-07), a work in Japanese on the rules of the monks' hall (sōdō). This text later found its way into the 95-kan SBGZ. In the same year he composed two texts, the SBGZ senmen 洗面 (DZZ, 1, 429-44) and SBGZ senjō 洗淨 (ibid., 466-74), concerned with the procedures for the monks' ablutions and use of the lavatory (tōsu 東司). Both these works were originally presented as lectures at Kōshō-ji.

21. The so-called Mana 真字, or Chinese, SBGZ (SBGZ sanbyaku soku 三百則, DZZ, 2, 201-52) was apparently not well known to the tradition and did not circulate widely until the eighteenth century. It was first published, together with the commentary of Shigetsu Ein 指月慧印 (1689-1764), in 1767 under the title, Nenpyō sanbyaku soku funō go 拈評三百則不能語. For many years thereafter Sōtō scholars debated the authenticity of the work. In the 1930s, however, an ancient MS of kan 2 of the text, bearing a colophon dated 1288, was discovered in the Kanazawa Bunko 金沢文庫, and since that time two other early MSS have been uncovered. On the basis of this evidence, the Sanbyaku soku is now widely accepted as the work of Dōgen. The 1235 date of compilation is provided by the colophon of a preface purportedly by Dōgen himself. (For a discussion of the MSS and comparative table of the four extant texts, see Kawamura Kōdō, "Mana SBGZ no kenkyū 真字正法眼蔵の研究, KDBGKK, 30[3/1972], pp. 135-59; 31 [3/1973], pp. 95-138; 33 [3/1975], pp. 41-96; 34 [3/76], pp. 64-98. A convenient, though now somewhat dated, bibliography on this important text can be found in Kawamura, "SBGZ no seiritsu no sho-mondai 正法眼蔵の成立の諸問題, in Kurebayashi, ed., Dōgen zen no shisō-teki kenkyū, p. 597, n. 5. Among more recent publications we may note especially the detailed bibliographic study by Ishii Shūdō 石井修道, "Mana SBGZ no motozuku shiryō ni tsuite" 真字正法眼蔵のもとずく資料について, Sōtō-shū kenkyū-in kenkyū-sei kenkyū

kiyō 曹洞宗研究員研究生研究紀要, 3 [10/1974], pp. 51-82.)

22. Of the approximately 90 texts included in the various early redactions of the SBGZ, only six were composed prior to 1240. In that year Dōgen wrote seven; in 1241, eleven; in 1242, sixteen; in 1243, twenty-three; and in 1244, eleven. (For a convenient chronological table of the SBGZ texts, see Zen Bunka Gakuin 禅文化学院, ed., Gendai yaku SBGZ 現代訳正法眼蔵 [Tokyo: Seishin Shobō, 1968], pp. 224-25.)

23. DZZ, 1, 90-101. Texts from around this period include the Daigo 大悟 (DZZ, 1, 82-87), Butsu kōjō ji 仏向上事 (ibid., 224-30), Inmo 恁麼 (ibid., 162-68), Gyōji 行持 (ibid., 122-61), and Kaiin zanmai 海印三昧 (ibid., 102-07). Of Dōgen's move to Echizen in 1243 we shall have more to say below.

24. "Tso-ch'an chen" 坐禅箴, T. 48 (2001), 98a-b.

25. In the Honzan edition it occurs as fascicle 27. This text was not included in either the 60- or 28-kan redactions. The various MSS and textual traditions of the Japanese SBGZ mentioned here and in the following discussion are reviewed in Appendix A of this paper.

26. DZZ, 1, 101. The source of this date is not clear from any of the extant MSS. The text in DZZ, 1, is based on the Kōfuku-ji MS, with textual notes to the other early versions.

27. Akishige, "SBGZ kō," pp. 472ff. This article,

published more than 25 years ago, deserves more attention than it seems to have received. Its basic argument has since been repeated -- without reference to, and with considerably less elegance than, Akishige's work -- in Kinoshita Jun'ichi 木下純一, "FKZZG no kenkyū," SK, 7 (4/1965), pp. 132-37; and in Furuta Shōkin, Nihon bukkyō shisō-shi no shomondai 日本仏教思想史の諸問題 (Tokyo: Shunjūsha, 1964), pp. 137-44.

28. A suggestion made, as we have noted, by Ōkubo Dōshū; see above, n. 15.

29. According to the Kenzei-ki (SSZ, Shiden, 2, 23), Dōgen left Kōshō-ji for Echizen on the sixteenth of the seventh month (August 3) of 1243. This notice appears trustworthy: we know from the colophon of the SBGZ kattō 葛藤 (DZZ, 1, 336) that Dōgen was still at Kōshō-ji on the seventh day of this month; the colophon of the SBGZ sangai yui shin 三界唯心 (DZZ, 1, 357) indicates that he was lecturing in Echizen by the first of the seventh intercalary month (August 17).

Yoshimine-dera 吉峰寺 (or 吉嶺寺; also known as Kippō-ji) and Yamashi-bu are thought to have been located several miles east of the later site of Eihei-ji. (For a convenient map of this area, see Imaeda, Dōgen: Zazen hitosuji no shamon, p. 147.) The origin and history of these two monasteries is unknown, but apparently they were already established when Dōgen arrived. They were quite close to the major Tendai monastic center at Heisen-ji

平泉寺, and it has been speculated that they belonged to the Haku-san 白山 Tendai order. (See ibid., pp. 146-47. The Tendai connection was first suggested by Menzan; Ōkubo [Dōgen zenji den no kenkyū, pp. 216-17] doubts this connection and suggests a Shingon affiliation for Yoshimine-dera.)

30. For a chart of the titles of these texts and the locations where they were taught, see Imaeda, Dōgen: Zazen hitosuji no shamon, p. 148.

31. The text published in DZZ, 1, 88-89, is based on the 60-kan Dōun-ji MS, with reference to the 75-kan and other early traditions. The colophon of this text will be discussed below.

32. Here and in the following discussion the reader may wish to consult the comparative table of the texts of the documents in question given in the appendix to this paper. In this instance, note especially the following lines in the wabun text:

1. 作仏を図する事なかれ坐臥を脱落すべし
2. 兀兀と坐定して思量箇不思量底なり不思量底如何思量これ非思量なり
3. 坐禅は習禅にあらず

33. Note especially the innovations in the following:

1. 善也不思量なり悪也不思量なり心意識にあらず念想観にあらず
2. 坐臥を脱落すべし
3. かくのごとく身心をととのへて

4. 不染汚の修證なり

34. Eihei SBGZ shūsho taisei 永平正法眼蔵蒐書大成, Dai Honzan Eihei-ji Nai Eihei SBGZ Shūsho Taisei Kankō Kai 大本山永平寺内永平正法眼蔵蒐書大成刊行会, comp., vol. 5 (Tokyo: Taishūkan, 1978), p. 514. Previous writers have been content simply to ignore the Daibutsu-ji reference, though prima facie there seems no reason to distrust the Rurikō-ji MS. This MS represents an 83-kan SBGZ, a redaction based on the 60-kan tradition, supplemented by 23 works from the 75-kan collection. According to notes in the text, the Rurikō-ji SBGZ was copied over a three year period beginning in 1490 from MSS produced in 1433-34.

35. SSZ, Shiden, 2, 24-25. The dates for Dōgen's move to Daibutsu-ji and for his meditation retreat the following year are confirmed by the EHKR, which records several of his jōdō from this period. (See DZZ, 2, 30-31.) The exact location of Daibutsu-ji is uncertain. According to tradition, it was located several miles from the present site of Eihei-ji; it was then moved to this latter site by the fifth abbot, Giun. Ōkubo Dōshū, who personally went to inspect the site, accepts the tradition of the original location but suggests that the move was made by the third abbot, Gikai 義介 (1219-83). (Dōgen zenji den no kenkyū, pp. 217-22; see also Shibata Dōken, Zenji Dōgen no shisō, pp. 302-07.)

36. In the first two months of 1244, just prior to his move to Daibutsu-ji, Dōgen produced eleven SBGZ texts. Thereafter, for the space of a full year we have no dated texts

at all, and the total for his two years at Daibutsu-ji amounts to only five. We have only two dated texts from Dōgen's subsequent Eihei-ji period, but it is assumed that many of the undated texts in the 12-kan Shinsō 新草 SBGZ were produced at this time.

The Eihei shingi is a collection of six works brought together by the thirtieth abbot of Eihei-ji, Kōshō Chidō 光紹智堂 (d. 1670), and first published in 1667 under the title, Nichiiki Sōtō shoso Dōgen zenji shingi 日域曹洞宗初祖道元禅師清規. The popular modern edition of this collection was brought out in 1794 by Gentō Sokuchū 玄透即中 (1729-1807). The first of the texts in the Eihei shingi, the Tenzo kyōkun, was written while Dōgen was still at Kōshō-ji; a second, the Tai taiko goge jari hō 對大己五夏闍梨法 (DZZ, 2, 308-12), was composed in the third month of 1244, just prior to Dōgen's move from Yoshimine. Except for the Bendō-hō (DZZ, 2, 313-19), the remainder date from the Eihei-ji period: the Chiji shingi 知事清規 (DZZ, 2, 320-46), composed 15/6/1246; the Shuryō shingi 衆寮清規 (DZZ, 2, 363-66), composed 1/1/1249; and the Fu shukuhan pō 赴粥飯法 (DZZ, 2, 348-57), the date of which is unrecorded. The Tenzo kyōkun and Chiji shingi are extant in MSS, housed at Eihei-ji, dated 1502; there is also a colophon for the Tai taiko hō thought to be in Dōgen's own hand. Otherwise, the early history of these texts is unknown. (For a discussion of the Eihei shingi texts, see Ōkubo, Dōgen zenji shingi 道元禅師

清規, Iwanami bunko, 2896-98 [Tokyo: Iwanami Shoten, 1941], pp. 271ff.)

37. See Ōkubo, Dōgen zenji den no kenkyū, p. 342. The SBGZ ango, which gives instructions on the procedures for the summer meditation retreat, was also composed during this period, on the thirteenth of the sixth month.

38. Akishige, "FKZZG kō," p. 480.

39. Note especially these parallels to the wabun text:

1. 正坐禪時必用蒲團
2. 目須正開不張不微
3. 身心俱調

40. It is interesting -- and not entirely gratuitous -- to note that the latter date would imply that, just as Dōgen composed the original Tenpuku draft of the FKZZG on the occasion of the first meditation retreat at Kōshō-ji, so he returned to work on that text around the time of the first ango at his new monastery in Echizen.

41. Note especially these passages:

1. 或半跏趺坐亦可...兩手大指面相拄
2. 謂頂顱脊骨相拄而端直
3. 内外放寬

42. He also relies on the Ch'an-yüan ch'ing-kuei in the Ango and other texts of the SBGZ from this period. For a list of these citations, see Kagamishima Genryū, Dōgen zenji to inyō kyōten, goroku no kenkyū 道元禪師と引用經典語錄の研究 (Tokyo: Mokujisha, 1965), pp. 262-63. It should be noted that this list covers only explicit

quotations.

43. The only other text which comes readily to mind that does not follow this general pattern is the SBGZ darani 陀羅尼 (DZZ, 1, 419-23), a work of 1243 on the nature of Buddhist worship.

THE SOURCES OF THE FUKAN ZAZEN-GI: TSUNG-TSE'S TSO-CH'AN I AND THE T'IEN-T'AI HSIAO CHIH-KUAN

We have seen in the preceding chapters that the Tso-ch'an i, on which Dōgen based his own meditation manual, is included in the Ch'an-yüan ch'ing-kuei, the monastic code compiled in 1103 by Ch'ang-lu Tsung-tse 長蘆宗賾 (d.u.).[1] Although in his "FKZZG senjutsu yurai" Dōgen clearly associates the Tso-ch'an i with this code and identifies its author as "Tse Shih" 賾師, in fact the origin of the manual is not entirely clear.[2] The popular text of the Ch'an-yüan ch'ing-kuei circulating in the Southern Sung during Dōgen's stay there was based on a revised and enlarged edition first published in 1202 by a certain Yü Hsiang 虞翔 (d.u.). This edition includes the Tso-ch'an i in chüan 8.[3] There is, however, a Korean printing of the Ch'an-yüan ch'ing-kuei, dating from 1254, which does not contain the meditation manual. Since this text is thought to be based on a Northern Sung printing of 1111, it may well represent the earliest extant version of the Ch'an-yüan ch'ing-kuei.[4] Hence, it is by no means certain that the Tso-ch'an i was included in Tsung-tse's original code of 1103.

This uncertainty over the provenance of the work is heightened by the fact that from early times it seems to

have circulated as an independent treatise. An abbreviated version already appears in the "Dhyāna" section of the *Ta-tsang i-lan* 大藏一覽, the lengthy compendium of scriptural passages composed by Ch'en Shih 陳實 (d.u.) sometime prior to 1157.[5] Somewhat later, the manual was combined with the *Hsin-hsin ming* 信心銘, the *Cheng-tao ko* 證道歌, and K'uo-an's 廓庵 *Shih-niu t'u* 十牛圖, to form the collection known in Japan as the *Shibu-roku* 四部錄.[6] At around this same time, in 1313, the *Tso-ch'an i* was included in the *Tzu-men ching-hsün* 緇門警訓, compiled by Yung-chung 永中 (d.u.).[7]

Although the *Tzu-men ching-hsün* ascribes the *Tso-ch'an i* to Ch'ang-lu Tsung-tse, neither the *Ta-tsang i-lan* nor the *Shibu-roku* identifies the author of its text. Still, there seems little reason to doubt Tsung-tse's authorship. The work almost certainly dates from his lifetime: since it appears in the *Ta-tsang i-lan*, we know that it was composed prior to 1157; since it makes reference to the Ch'an master Fa-yün Fa-hsiu 法雲法秀 (1027-1090), it cannot be earlier than mid-eleventh century. This reference to Fa-hsiu is particularly significant because, as Prof. Yanagida has pointed out, it lends credence to the work's ascription to Tsung-tse.[8] Although little is known of Tsung-tse's life, several brief biographies identify him as a disciple of Ch'ang-lu Ying-fu 長蘆應夫 (d.u.) in the Yün-men 雲門 line of Ch'an.[9] Ying-fu was himself a disciple of T'ien-i I-huai 天衣義懷 (993-1064), the teacher of Fa-hsiu. Indeed, the

biographies tell us that Tsung-tse originally entered the order under Fa-hsiu.[10] Thus, Tsung-tse's close personal connection with Fa-hsiu is clear, and the appearance of the latter's teaching in the Tso-ch'an i provides persuasive circumstantial evidence for Tsung-tse's authorship.

However the Tso-ch'an i first found its way into the Ch'an-yüan ch'ing-kuei, by the thirteenth century when Dōgen visited China it had become an integral part of the monastic code. Thereafter, although it was not included in the several codes composed during the Southern Sung and early Yüan, it reappeared in the important Ch'ih-hsiu Po-chang ch'ing-kuei 勅修百丈清規, composed in 1338 by Te-hui 德輝 (d.u.).[11] This work, compiled by order of the last Mongol emperor, Shun-tsung (r. 1333-67), became the standard code for the Ch'an monasteries of the Ming. Soon after its publication it was taken to Japan, where it was adopted for the regulation of the monasteries of the gozan system. In this way, through the widespread popularity of the Ch'ih-hsiu ch'ing-kuei, Tsung-tse's Tso-ch'an i became one of the basic meditation texts for the monks of both China and Japan.[12]

The authors of the Ch'an monastic codes, beginning with Tsung-tse, tend inevitably to invoke the name of Po-chang Huai-hai 百丈懷海 (720-814), creator of the first set of rules for Ch'an monasteries. This fidelity to his name notwithstanding, it is doubtful that any of these men actually knew the details of Huai-hai's regulations. Despite it fame

and its obvious significance for the history of the Ch'an movement, the Po-chang ch'ing-kuei, which one might expect to have been deposited in every Ch'an monastic library, does not seem to have been transmitted to the Sung.[13] Why the school did not preserve such a seemingly important document is not clear: its disappearance, like that of many other Buddhist books, may have been the result of the general disruption in Chinese society accompanying the breakup of the T'ang empire; but it is also quite possible that Huai-hai's work was not in fact a detailed set of regulations of the sort provided by the Ch'an-yüan ch'ing-kuei and subsequent codes, and that we are misled by these later works into looking for a text that never existed. Huai-hai's importance for the later tradition clearly rests more on his general advocacy of independent Ch'an institutions and practices than it does on his specific recommendations for the regulation thereof; and whatever practices he introduced in his community at Po-chang Shan, in terms of a written monastic code, he may have left little more than is found in the brief reports preserved by his Sung biographers.[14]

In any case, what is important for us to note here is that, whether or not Tsung-tse actually saw the illusive Po-chang ch'ing-kuei, it is unlikely that his own code bears much resemblance to Huai-hai's regulations. Tsung-tse himself states, in his preface to the Ch'an-yüan ch'ing-kuei, that he is revising Po-chang's rules to fit the circumstances of his day (Zen'en shingi, p. 3); and given the

radical changes in the Ch'an monastic institution which had taken place in the centuries between the mid-T'ang and the Sung, we may be sure that much in the Ch'an-yüan ch'ing-kuei would have been unfamiliar to Po-chang.[15] Particularly when we turn to the Tso-ch'an i, the connection with Huai-hai seems remote indeed. There is no evidence that this T'ang master ever wrote a meditation manual, and especially if Tsung-tse's own manual was not originally intended for the Ch'an-yüan ch'ing-kuei, there is no reason to think that it was based on Po-chang's code.

In his "FKZZG senjutsu yurai," as we have seen, Dōgen takes Tsung-tse to task for failing to accurately transmit Po-chang's teachings.

> In the Ch'an-yüan ch'ing-kuei there is a Tso-ch'an i. Though it follows Po-chang's original intention, it adds several new clauses by Tse Shih. These places in general have errors of many sorts and suffer throughout from lack of clarity. (DZZ, 2, 6.)

At first glance, it appears that Dōgen is here criticizing Tsung-tse on the basis of his own knowledge of Huai-hai's meditation teachings. Indeed, the passage has given rise to speculation that he obtained and read the Po-chang ch'ing-kuei during his stay in China.[16] Yet almost certainly this is not the case. Had Dōgen known the text of Po-chang's famous work, he would surely have made use of it;

but, as Kagamishima Genryū has demonstrated, all of his many quotations from Ch'an monastic regulations are traceable to the Ch'an-yüan ch'ing-kuei.[17] The apparent judgement of the "Senjutsu yurai" that Tsung-tse has added "new clauses" (shinjō 新條) to Po-chang's text is not, in fact, a judgement but is simply taken from the preface of the Ch'an-yüan ch'ing-kuei itself. (Zen'en shingi, p. 3.) The errors which Dōgen purports to find in the manual surely have nothing to do with textual questions: they concern the understanding of meditation practice; and, as is clear from the FKZZG, Dōgen "corrects" them, not by a return to Po-chang's text, but by rewriting the manual -- often in reliance on material which postdates Huai-hai. Indeed, Dōgen himself makes clear the religious basis of his dissatisfaction with the Tso-ch'an i in the summation of his criticism of Tsung-tse: "He knows nothing of an understanding beyond words; who can fail to realize this?"

In the absence of any evidence that Po-chang authored a manual of meditation, Tsung-tse's Tso-ch'an i represents the earliest known work of its kind in the Ch'an tradition. In one sense, this is rather surprising; for the very name of the school is, after all, taken from dhyāna, and meditation practice was undoubtedly always a central feature of Ch'an monastic life. Moreover, as Dōgen himself reminds us, we have a large number of texts known variously as tso-ch'an chen 坐禪箴, tso-ch'an ming 坐禪銘, tso-shih ming 坐石銘, and so on, which derive from, and celebrate the

spirit of, meditation.[18] Hence, one might expect the school to have developed a rich literature on the techniques of the practice of tso-ch'an. In fact, it does not appear to have done so.

Among the eighth century documents from Tun-huang we do have several texts, associated especially with the Tung Shan 東山 tradition of the patriarchs Tao-hsin 道信 (580-651) and Hung-jen 弘忍 (601-764), which provide explicit instruction on the basic features of certain meditation practices. While there is some variety in the specific techniques recommended, it is clear that at least this early lineage of the school maintained a coherent meditation tradition. The practices of this tradition, though greatly simplified and reinterpreted in the spirit of the new Ch'an movement, are grounded in earlier sūtra and śāstra literature; moreover, in many respects they are remarkably similar to the practices recommended four centuries later by Tsung-tse.[19] Nevertheless, with the rise of the so-called Southern school of Shen-hui 神會 (670-762), the meditation teachings of the earlier tradition came under severe criticism as inconsistent with the Ch'an understanding of the nature of the mind and actually detrimental to the attainment of bodhi. The Southern school redefined the very term tso-ch'an, interpreting it, not as a technique for control of the mind, but as the activity of the enlightened mind itself -- a mind, we are assured, already possessed by all beings. Traditional meditative practices intended to

cultivate special states of mind, therefore, were rejected as a feature of the gradual (chien 漸) teaching, inappropriate for the followers of Bodhidharma's sudden (tun 頓) school.[20]

This criticism of dhyāna practice undoubtedly served as a powerful factor in the inhibition of further development of Ch'an meditation literature during the second half of the T'ang. The masters of this period -- especially those of the dominant Hung-chou 洪州 school of Ma-tsu Tao-i 馬祖道一 (709-88) -- turned their often remarkable energies to the creation of new teaching techniques appropriate to the spirit of the sudden doctrine. Orthodox forms of study and practice were superseded -- at least in the imagination of the tradition -- by revolutionary methods, such as beating and shouting (pang ho) or spontaneous dialogue (wen-ta 問答); and formal treatises elucidating Buddhist doctrine and praxis gave way to poetry and the records of anecdotes and sayings (yü-lu 語錄).

These developments notwithstanding, it is doubtful that many Ch'an monks, even in this period, actually escaped the practice of tso-ch'an. The sudden doctrine, from which the new, more radical forms of Ch'an emerged, involved a re-definition of meditation but not necessarily its denial. As in earlier Mahāyāna criticism of abhidharma practice and, indeed, Dōgen's later attack on the practices of Sung dynasty Ch'an, the issue was more one of the correct approach to, and understanding of, meditation than it was of whether or not to practice it. Whatever the idiosyncracies

of individual masters may have been, there is ample evidence to show that tso-ch'an remained a basic element in the training of Ch'an monks. Indeed, the very fact that these masters occasionally felt obliged to make light of it can be seen as an indication of its tenacity in the tradition. It is probably safe to assume that even as the T'ang teachers labored to warn their disciples against fixed notions of Buddhist practice, the monks continued to sit with legs crossed and tongues pressed against their palates.[21]

By the mid-Sung and the time of Tsung-tse, of course, the Ch'an movement had undergone considerable change. It represented by then the central monastic institution of Chinese Buddhism, rapidly coming under control of the state. Tsung-tse's Ch'an-yüan ch'ing-kuei is itself testimony to the size and complexity of the Sung monastic system and the bureaucratic nature of its structure. From this institutional base Ch'an monks were coming into greater contact with the lay political and intellectual elite and were falling under the influence of the new classicism of a resurgent Confucian scholarship. In response to these new conditions, the school turned, on the one hand, to the regulation of its institutions and practices and, on the other, to the study and appreciation of its own classical tradition.

Tsung-tse stands near the beginning of these tendencies which were soon to characterize the Ch'an of the Southern Sung. His Ch'an-yüan ch'ing-kuei, while providing the basis for all subsequent monastic codes, remains largely innocent

of the rules and practices associated with the later wu-shan 五山 system. His Tso-ch'an i, while reflecting a growing interest in the popularization of practical meditation techniques, gives no hint of the new forms of k'an-hua 看話 practice which were to capture the attention of the school during the Southern Sung. Rather, in his meditation teaching Tsung-tse turns back to the basic practices of the earlier tradition and to the famous meditation texts which expound them.

Tsung-tse himself points us toward some of the sources of his teaching. In the Tso-ch'an i, in his discussion of the "doings of Māra" (mo-shih 魔事) which can afflict the higher stages of meditation, he advises his reader to consult the Śūraṅgama-sūtra, T'ien-t'ai's Chih-kuan 天台止觀, and Kuei-feng's Hsiu-cheng i 圭峰修證儀. Hence, we can assume that he was familiar with these works and had them in mind when he composed his manual. Of the three, the first presumably refers to the T'ang text in ten rolls usually attributed to Paramiti, a work which contains a detailed discussion of fifty demoniacal states of mind into which the practitioner may fall.[22] While the Tso-ch'an i mentions the Śūraṅgama for its discussion of mo-shih, there is little else in the text to suggest that Tsung-tse made use of the sūtra in his description of meditation. Such is not the case with the other two works he mentions, which clearly have a closer connection with his own manual.

We cannot say with certainty which text Tsung-tse

intends by his reference to the *Chih-kuan*. Obviously, one thinks first of the famous *Mo-ho chih-kuan* 摩訶止觀, by T'ien-t'ai Chih-i 天台智顗 (538-97), a work which includes two lengthy sections on the various morbid and demoniacal states to which the meditator is susceptible. (*T.* 46 [1911], 106c-111c, 114c-117a.) Similar discussions, however, appear in other of Chih-i's meditation texts, and it would seem that a more likely candidate here is the so-called *T'ien-t'ai hsiao chih-kuan* 天台小止觀.[23] Not only does the *Hsiao chih-kuan* contain an explanation of *mo-shih* (470b-472b), more importantly, it provides a concrete description of the preparation for, and practice of, meditation many of the elements of which are clearly reflected in the *Tso-ch'an i*. Moreover, it is the basis for the discussion of meditation practice in the *Hsiu-cheng i*, the other work to which Tsung-tse refers us.

The *Yüan-chüeh ching tao-ch'ang hsiu-cheng i* 圓覺經道場修證儀 (*ZZ*. 2B, 1, 361-498), by Kuei-feng Tsung-mi 圭峰宗密 (780-841), represents an extended explication of Buddhist practice according to the *Yüan-chüeh ching*. It consists of three major divisions, dealing with the conditions for practice (*tao-ch'ang fa-shih* 道場法事), the method of worship (*li-ch'an fa-men* 禮懺法門), and the method of meditation (*tso-ch'an fa* 坐禪法).[24] As Sekiguchi Shindai has shown, large sections of the text, especially of the first and third divisions, are taken directly from the *Hsiao chih-kuan*. Indeed, when these sections are

assembled and rearranged, it appears that Tsung-mi has quoted Chih-i's work almost _in toto_. It is these same passages, in which the _Hsiu-cheng i_ is relying on the _Hsiao chih-kuan_, that seem to have influenced Tsung-tse's _Tso-ch'an i_.[25]

The _T'ien-t'ai hsiao chih-kuan_'s discussion of meditation practice is divided into ten chapters covering, in addition to the morbid and demoniacal states, such topics as control of desire (_ho yü_ 呵欲) and abandonment of the _nivaraṇas_ (_ch'i kai_ 棄蓋), development of _kuśula-mūla_ (_shan fa_ 善發), practice of _śamatha_ and _vipaśyanā_ (_cheng hsiu_ 正修), and so on. Of these chapters, the first, on fulfilling the conditions for meditation (_chü yüan_ 具緣) and especially the fourth, on regulating physical and mental activities in meditation (_t'iao-ho_ 調和), contain material which parallels the _Tso-ch'an i_. In his studies of the _T'ien-t'ai hsiao chih-kuan_, Prof. Sekiguchi has called attention to these parallels and has emphasized the extent to which, not only Tsung-tse's work, but all the subsequent manuals of Ch'an and Zen -- including Dōgen's _FKZZG_ -- have relied, at least indirectly, on the T'ien-t'ai work. In his _Tendai shikan no kenkyū_ (pp. 328-35), he provides us with an elaborate table comparing the relevant sections of the _Hsiao chih-kuan_ and _Hsiu-cheng i_ with some of the most famous of these manuals. Such comparison clearly supports his general contention that Chih-i's presentation of _tso-ch'an_ influenced Tsung-tse -- and through Tsung-tse, the

FKZZG.

The T'ien-t'ai hsiao chih-kuan, although for the most part a summation of material developed in much greater detail in the Tz'u-ti ch'an-men, Mo-ho chih-kuan, and other of Chih-i's writings, differs from these works in being expressly intended to introduce the beginner to the practice of meditation. To this end, it includes in its "T'iao-ho" chapter a concrete description of how to assume the proper posture of seated meditation. Needless to say, this posture was not invented by Chih-i; and, in fact, his description of it follows a standard format appearing in earlier translations of Indian works.[26] These earlier descriptions are extremely brief and schematic; and for the most part, in the many texts of the Chinese canon which deal with meditation, there is little concrete information on the form of the practice. Buddhist authors before Chih-i appear to have been content to leave instruction in the physical details of tso-ch'an to the oral tradition. The "T'iao-ho" chapter of the Hsiao chih-kuan, which introduces some of the oral tradition into the literary format, represents the first systematic discussion of these details available to the Chinese. It is not surprising, then, that later writers, from Shan-tao 善導 (617-81), Tao-hsüan 道宣 (596-667), and Fa-tsang 法藏 (643-712) on, referred to this chapter in their own presentations of tso-ch'an.[27] Particularly in the case of a brief work like Tsung-tse's Tso-ch'an i, which was itself intended as a meditation primer, the influence of

Chih-i's manual was probably almost inevitable.

The parallels between the *T'ien-t'ai hsiao chih-kuan* and *Tso-ch'an i*, however, should not blind us to the fact that, unlike the *tso-ch'an* section of Tsung-mi's *Hsiu-cheng i*, Tsung-tse's manual is essentially an original work, which, while borrowing certain elements of the *Hsiao chih-kuan*, freely develops its own presentation of meditation. Careful comparison of the two texts reveals that the influence of the *Hsiao chih-kuan* on Tsung-tse's description of *tso-ch'an* practice is limited almost wholly to certain preliminary considerations and to the physical aspects of meditation. Since it is precisely in these matters that one would expect to find the least innovation, Prof. Sekiguchi's point, while remaining valid, becomes rather less interesting than it might at first appear. Of Chih-i's central practice of *chih-kuan* itself, we see not a word in the *Tso-ch'an i*; and when we come to the crucial questions of how to control the mind and how to interpret the experience of meditation, Tsung-tse quickly parts company with the T'ien-t'ai text and embarks on his own explanations based on sources in the Ch'an tradition.[28]

In brief, then, Tsung-tse's relationship to the *Hsiao chih-kuan* is an ambivalent one: he both follows Chih-i and leaves him behind. This kind of ambivalence is worth bearing in mind when we consider Dōgen's uses of his own Chinese sources; for a very similar relationship holds between his *zazen* manuals and their Chinese antecedents. On the one

hand, Dōgen obviously relies heavily on Tsung-tse; and, in fact, almost one third of his Tenpuku text is lifted directly from the Tso-ch'an i. Inevitably, then, his manuals also indirectly reflect the teachings of the Hsiao chih-kuan. More interesting is the fact that we find in these manuals several passages which strongly suggest that Dōgen may have consulted Chih-i's text and reintroduced certain of the latter's material omitted by Tsung-tse.[29] To this extent it becomes possible to trace the conscious influences on Dōgen's meditation teachings back at least to a sixth century work predating the formation of an independent Ch'an movement. The significance of this continuity with the early Chinese meditation tradition should not be lost on us. Contrary to the exuberant claims of some of his more partisan interpreters, Dōgen did not create his zazen doctrine ex nihilo. Like Tsung-tse, on the one hand he draws on concrete practices common to Chinese Buddhism as a whole, and on the other he introduces teachings specific to the Ch'an tradition. If he differs from Tsung-tse in this regard, it is primarily in the emphasis he places on these latter elements. But whether they are faithful to the Tso-ch'an i or they depart from it to reinterpret the practice, Dōgen's manuals rely on material worked out in China centuries earlier. Nor should this surprise us, for Dōgen himself repeatedly emphasizes that his zazen is the ancient practice of the Patriarchs. While the truth may be somewhat more complicated, the claim is not an idle one.

At the same time, of course, we know from the "FKZZG senjutsu yurai" that Dōgen sought to dissociate his zazen-gi from its textual sources, and there can be no doubt that he considered his own work far superior to any manual previously produced in China or Japan. Indeed, so confident was he in this superiority that he dismissed, in effect, the entire body of meditation literature we have been discussing here. We have earlier had occasion to note that Dōgen begins his "Senjutsu yurai" with the statement, "The special transmission outside the scripture, the treasury of the eye of the true dharma, has never been heard of in our kingdom." He then goes on to add, "Nor, needless to say, has any zazen-gi been transmitted down to us." (DZZ, 2, 6.) It appears from this that Dōgen would have us believe that his own manual represents the first Japanese contact with the literature of zazen. This conceit notwithstanding, we know, of course, that his contemporaries were quite familiar with the Chinese meditation texts and were, in fact, the inheritors of a long Japanese tradition of zazen.

As early as the eighth century Chih-i's works on chih-kuan practice, including the Hsiao chih-kuan, were already available in Japan.[30] It was contact with these texts that led Saichō 最澄 (767-822) to undertake the study of T'ien-t'ai and ultimately to found an independent Tendai institution on Hiei-zan. Saichō, who is also known to have studied the teachings of Ch'an, was himself an ardent exponent of meditation and established a Shishu-zanmai-in 四種三昧

院 on Hiei-zan for the training of monks in the practices described in the Mo-ho chih-kuan. Thereafter, with the rise to prominence of the Hiei-zan Tendai establishment, Chih-i's writings became one of the major sources for Heian Buddhism, and shikan one of its major practices.[31]

Thus, by the thirteenth century, when the FKZZG was composed, the Japanese Buddhist community was well versed in the basic methods of zazen. But beyond this, it had already been introduced to the teachings of Chinese Ch'an and, in fact, to the text of Tsung-tse's meditation manual itself. Throughout the Heian period Japanese pilgrims to the mainland continued to bring back the writings of the Ch'an school; and by the twelfth century, as access to China improved, they began actively to pursue Ch'an studies abroad and to return with the new literature of the school then circulating in the Sung. Among these late Heian pilgrims, of course, was the Tendai monk Yōsai, and among the books which he apparently brought back to Japan were the writings of Ch'ang-lu Tsung-tse.[32]

Yōsai visited China twice, in 1168 and again in 1187. In the Kōzen gokoku ron, written in 1189 after his second visit, he quotes the Ch'an-yüan ch'ing-kuei at the very outset and refers to it again several times throughout his treatise. Most importantly for our purposes, he also includes the text of a brief zazen-gi which clearly represents an abbreviation of Tsung-tse's Tso-ch'an i.[33] Since Dōgen studied for several years at Yōsai's monastery with the

latter's disciple Myōzen, there can be no doubt that he was familiar with the Kōzen gokoku ron.[34] Hence, his statement in the "Senjutsu yurai" that no zazen-gi had yet been transmitted to Japan is an odd one; it apparently tells us more about Dōgen than it does about history.

In one sense, Dōgen's statement may be interpreted simply as an expression of his pride in being the first to introduce a complete Zen meditation manual. Chih-i's works, for all their wealth of meditation instruction, do not, after all, come out of the Ch'an tradition Dōgen studied in China. Yōsai's text, while it belongs to that tradition, remains an extremely truncated version of the Tso-ch'an i, consigned to a series of brief quotations from various Buddhist sources. Consequently, Dōgen, who presumably discovered Tsung-tse's original while in China, might well have felt that the Japanese still lacked the complete transmission of an authentic zazen-gi. Yet this interpretation, though there may be truth in it, does not seem to go far enough; if it did, one would expect Dōgen to have been content simply to introduce the full text of the Tso-ch'an i. That he was not is an expression of his particular understanding of zazen and, hence, of a proper zazen manual.

In the Bendō-wa, written just prior to the Tenpuku FKZZG, Dōgen is asked by his (presumably fictitious) interlocutor to distinguish his own meditation doctrine from that of Tendai and Shingon and to explain how his practice differs from the common Buddhist exercises of dhyāna and

samādhi. (DZZ, 1, 734-36.) His response is that his zazen is the shōbō genzō, the true dharma handed down from Śākyamuni through Bodhidharma and the Ch'an Patriarchs. It is, in other words, the realization of the enlightenment of the Buddha himself -- or what Dōgen calls in the Bendō-wa, the ji juyū zanmai 自受用三昧 -- and it is not to be confused with ordinary meditation techniques. This response echoes a basic theme of the FKZZG, and it helps us to understand Dōgen's claim that no zazen-gi had previously been transmitted to Japan. For a proper zazen-gi must belong to the true tradition of zazen, a tradition inseparable from the Zen lineage of the shōbo genzō. Hence, the meditation texts of Tendai and other Buddhist traditions are excluded. At the same time, a proper zazen-gi must teach the true zazen, a zazen of perfect enlightenment. Hence, works like the Tso-ch'an i, which fail to convey "an understanding beyond words," do not count. If Tsung-tse's manual was the only zazen-gi before Dōgen's own FKZZG, and it does not count, the conclusion is obvious.

If one reads the Tso-ch'an i in the light of the Bendō-wa passage, the reason for Dōgen's dissatisfaction with it immediately becomes apparent. Tsung-tse's manual is an extraordinarily simple and straightforward work. Though it occasionally mentions prajñā or bodhi as the goal of meditation practice, one searches in vain for those brilliant, often glaring, displays of enlightenment that we, like Dōgen before us, have come to expect from the masters of Ch'an.

Instead, we find a humble -- one is tempted to say, honest -- work, almost wholly free from spiritual pretention and literary artifice. It is a work intended simply to encourage its reader to practice tso-ch'an and to instruct him in its basic features; on the ultimate meaning of that practice and its relation to the spiritual insights of the earlier Ch'an tradition, Tsung-tse is content to remain silent. In contrast, it is precisely in that meaning and those insights that Dōgen is most interested.

In the following chapter we shall take up the content of Dōgen's own text and compare it with that of Tsung-tse. As will become obvious there, the FKZZG is by no means intended simply as a practical guide to meditation. Indeed, only approximately one third of the work deals with the actual technique of zazen. The bulk of the FKZZG is devoted to a highly literary introduction, in which Dōgen expounds the rationale of Zen practice, and a lengthy conclusion, comprising a panegyric on the virtues of meditation and an exhortation to undertake its practice. These sections are composed in the ornate shiroku benrei 四六騈儷 style, popular among Dōgen's aristocratic contemporaries; in keeping with this style, they are heavy with allusion to earlier works and liberally laced with patches of purple that contrast sharply with Tsung-tse's quiet prose. The Tso-ch'an i, for example, warns us against procrastination in the following terms:

> Even if one devotes himself to the practice his entire life, he may still not be in time; how, then can one who procrastinates possibly overcome karma?

For this passage Dōgen substitutes:

> Since you have already attained the proper conjunction for a human body, do not pass your days in vain; when one always bears in mind the appropriate conduct of the way of the Buddha, who can carelessly enjoy the spark from a flint? Surely, form and substance are like the dew on the grass, and the fortunes of life like the lightening flash: in an instant they are empty; in a moment they are lost.

Similarly, Tsung-tse closes his essay with the advice:

> Friends in Ch'an, go over this text again and again. Benefitting others as well as ourselves, let us together achieve full enlightenment.

In the <u>FKZZG</u> we have:

> Eminent students [of the <u>dharma</u>], long accustomed to groping for the elephant, pray do not doubt the true dragon. Promptly take the right way, which points directly at reality; quickly become

the realized man, through with learning and free from action.

Careful attention to the relationship between the texts of the Tso-ch'an i and FKZZG reveals that many of the innovations of the latter are of the sort exemplified here -- that is, are largely a matter of the literary elaboration of themes originating in the Chinese manual. Whether or not one agrees with Dōgen's admirers that the FKZZG is almost without peer in the kanbun writings of Japanese Buddhism, it must be admitted that the stylistic revision of the Tso-ch'an i has transformed a technical manual into a literary work. In this revision Dōgen's text probably owes more in spirit and language to the poetic tradition of the tso-ch'an chen genre and texts like the Hsin-hsin ming and Cheng-tao ko than it does to any Chinese meditation manual.[35] This literary character of the FKZZG should not be forgotten when its teachings are compared with those of the Tso-ch'an i. Failure to keep it in mind will lead -- and, in fact, probably has led most commentators -- to an overemphasis on Dōgen's innovations in the explanation of zazen. As a work of Zen literature the FKZZG may well offer us more than the Tso-ch'an i, but this fact alone hardly justifies the conclusion that Dōgen's understanding of zazen practice was markedly different from -- not to mention deeper than -- Tsung-tse's. We must be careful here to distinguish literary interpretations of meditation from the practice itself and

avoid confusing the pointing finger with the moon.

At the same time, of course, it must be admitted that there is more to the FKZZG than art and more to Dōgen's disappointment with Tsung-tse than literary criticism. Behind the language there is the "understanding beyond words," Dōgen's vision of the true practice of Zen. As our Bendō-wa passage has indicated, the introduction into his manual of the deeper insights of the Ch'an tradition is intimately connected with this vision; and, in fact, particularly in the later Kōroku FKZZG, Dōgen lets these insights spill over, so to speak, into the description of the meditation method itself. In this way, practical instruction becomes almost inseparably intertwined with theoretical interpretation, and -- to put the matter in traditional Ch'an terms -- the practice of meditation (ting 定, samādhi) becomes indistinguishable from wisdom (hui 慧, prajñā).

The interpretation of Dōgen's zazen and its relation to other types of Buddhist meditation depends in large measure on the relative emphasis given to the practical and theoretical aspects of his teaching. Prof. Sekiguchi, for one, has focused on those concrete instructions in meditation technique which the FKZZG inherited through Tsung-tse from the Hsiao chih-kuan; on the opposite side, several scholars have risen to what they consider Dōgen's defense to argue that it is precisely Tsung-tse's reflection of the traditional T'ien-t'ai understanding of meditation that led Dōgen to reject the Tso-ch'an i.[36] Undoubtedly there is truth in both these

positions; what is important is that we not adhere solely to either one of them. If we emphasize only the practical side of _zazen_, we shall end in reducing it to a mechanical technique for the alteration of consciousness and deprive it of that element of wisdom without which it loses its Buddhist meaning; if, on the other hand, we focus only on the theoretical framework, we may find ourselves with an empty shell, an abstract doctrine which, however sublime, bears little resemblance to the actual experience of Buddhist mediators as they strive to put their religion into practice.

NOTES

1. References to this text hereinbelow are to the edition in Kagamishima Genryū, et al., *Yakuchū Zen'en shingi* 訳註禪苑清規 (Tokyo: Sōtō-shū Shūmu-chō, 1972). The following discussion of the texts of the *Tso-ch'an i* relies largely on Kagamishima's introduction to this work, pp. 1-28; and on Yanagida Seizan's *kaisetsu* 解説 in Kajitani Sōnin 梶谷宗忍, et al., *Shinjin-mei, Shōdō-ka, Jūgyō-zu, Zazen-gi* 信心銘 証道歌 十牛図 坐禅儀, *Zen no goroku*, 16 (Tokyo: Chikuma Shobō, 1971), pp. 225-38. For the date of compilation of the *Ch'an-yüan ch'ing-kuei*, see Tsung-tse's preface, *Zen'en shingi*, p. 3.

2. The "Senjutsu yurai" MS has "I Shih" 頤師, clearly a mistake for "Tse" 賾. This mistake has been carried over in Norman Waddell and Abe Masao, "Dōgen's *Fukanzazengi* and *Shōbōgenzō zazengi*," *Eastern Buddhist*, new series 6, 2 (10/1973), p. 16.

3. *Chung-tiao pu-chu Ch'an-yüan ch'ing-kuei* 重雕補註禪苑清規, *ZZ*. 2B, 16, 460c-61a. The 1202 printing itself is not extant, but several subsequent printings from as early as the thirteenth century are preserved in Japan. The oldest is thought to be a partial text in the Kanazawa Bunko. (*Zen'en shingi*, p. 6.)

4. *Zen'en shingi*, p. 7. It should be noted that the Korean text differs greatly in other respects from the popular version. For a comparison of the contents of the two traditions, see ibid., pp. 8-9. Kagamishima's edition provides textual notes for all the early versions.

5. See *Hōbō sōmokuroku* 法宝総目録, 3 (75), 1305a-b. Although this work is often said to date from the Ming, it bears a preface, dated 1157, by Chao Ling-chin 趙令衿, a lay disciple of Yüan-wu K'o-ch'in 圜悟克勤 (1036-1135). (See Yanagida Seizan, "Zenseki kaidai" 禪籍解題, in Nishitani Keiji 西谷啓治 and Yanagida, *Zenke goroku* 禪家語録, vol. 2, *Sekai koten bungaku zenshū* 世界古典文学全集, 36B [Tokyo: Chikuma Shobō, 1974], p. 496.)

6. The origin of this collection is unknown. It seems first to have appeared in Japan in a *gozan* 五山 printing of the late Kamakura (fourteenth century), and it is not clear whether the four texts had previously been collected in China. It is known that the *Hsin-hsin ming* and *Cheng-tao ko* were already circulating as a set in the Heian period, and Prof. Yanagida believes that the presence together in the *FKZZG* of passages from these two works and the *Tso-ch'an i* implies that Dōgen may have seen a collection of at least these three texts; he goes on to suggest that it was the *Tso-ch'an i* of this collection, rather than of the *Ch'an-yüan ch'ing-kuei*, which influenced the *FKZZG* text. (Kajitani, *Shinjin-mei*, pp. 182-83.) This suggestion, of course, ignores the evidence of the "*FKZZG* senjutsu yurai."

For the *Shibu-roku* text of the *Tso-ch'an i*, which differs very little from the *Ch'an-yüan ch'ing-kuei* version, see Ōmori Sōgen 大森曹玄, *Kunchū Zenshū shibu-roku* 訓註禪宗四部録 (Kyoto: Kichūdō, 1962), pp. 1-18.

7. *T*. 48 (2023), 1047b-c. This work in two *chüan* was based on an earlier compilation known as the *Tzu-lin pao-hsün* 緇林寶訓, the date and author of which, unfortunately, are unknown. *T*. 2023 represents a later expanded version in ten *chüan*. The *Tzu-men ching-hsün* text of the *Tso-ch'an i* is almost identical with that of the *Ch'an-yüan ch'ing-kuei*. This collection also includes a text of the *Kui-ching wen* 龜鏡文, taken from the *Ch'an-yüan ch'ing-kuei*; and if this latter was included in the original compilation, this would suggest that Yung-chung used Tsung-tse's code, rather than an independent text, as the source for his *Tso-ch'an i*.

8. Kajitani, *Shinjin-mei*, pp. 232-33. It should be noted that the earliest version of the text, in the *Ta-tsang i-lan*, does not include the reference to Fa-hsiu. But since this version is an abbreviation, its absence there, while not helping, does detract from Prof. Yanagida's argument.

9. *Hsü ch'uan-teng lu* 續傳燈録, *T*. 51 (2077), 539c26; *Chien-chung ching-kuo hsü teng lu* 建中靖國續燈録, *ZZ*. 2B, 9, 133c12; *Chia-t'ai p'u-teng lu* 嘉泰普燈録, *ZZ*. 2B, 10, 51c10; *Wu teng hui-yüan* 五燈會元, *ZZ*. 2B, 11, 317b16.

10. Particularly reliable is the notice in the *Hsü ch'uan-teng lu*, which was composed in 1101 by Fa-hsiu's disciple Fo-kuo Wei-po 佛國惟白 (d.u.)

11. T. 48 (2025), 1143a-b. This text has several interesting variants from the Ch'an-yüan ch'ing-kuei version. The Tso-ch'an i does not occur in the Ju-chung jih-yung ch'ing-kuei 入衆日用清規 (1209), the Ts'ung-lin chiao-ting ch'ing-kuei tsung-yao 叢林校定清規総要 (1274), or the Ch'an-lin pei-yung ch'ing-kuei 禪林備用清規 (1311).

12. For a summary of the Ch'an monastic codes and a discussion of their early role in Japan, see Imaeda Aishin, Chūsei zenshū-shi no kenkyū, pp. 56-72. The Tso-ch'an i of the Ch'ih-hsiu ch'ing-kuei is still studied by Japanese Rinzai monks; the Sōtō school, of course, uses the FKZZG as well as Keizan's 瑩山 Zazen yōjin-ki.

13. Knowledge of the Po-chang ch'ing-kuei in the Sung seems to have been limited to the brief notices attached to Huai-hai's biography in the Sung kao-seng chuan 宋高僧傳 (T. 50 [2061], 770c-771a) and Ching-te ch'uan-teng lu ("Ch'an-men kuei-shih" 禪門規式 T. 51, 250c-251b). These notices, while citing several features of Po-chang's rules, appear themselves to be based on secondhand information. (Cf. Ui Hakuju, who believed that they are direct quotations from the Po-chang ch'ing-kuei. [Zenshū-shi no kenkyū 禪宗史の研究, vol. 2 (Tokyo: Iwanami Shoten, 1941), p. 376.] Ui was of the opinion that the Po-chang ch'ing-kuei was still preserved on Po-chang Shan in the early fourteenth century [ibid., pp. 377-78], but this view has been refuted by Kagamishima Genryū [Dōgen zenji to inyō kyōten goroku no kenkyū, pp. 181-92].) At the latest, we know that in 1335,

when Te-hui composed his Ch'ih-hsiu ch'ing-kuei, there was no trace of Po-chang's work in China. (See his postface, T. 48, 1159a-b.) Tsung-tse includes the text of the "Ch'an-men kuei-shih" at the end of his Ch'an-yüan ch'ing-kuei ("Po-chang kuei-sheng" 百丈規繩, Zen'en shingi, pp. 340-88); see also "Pieh-li ch'an-chu" 別立禪居, Ta Sung seng shih lüeh 大宋僧史略, T. 54 (2126), 240a-b.

14. It should be noted in this regard that Huai-hai's epitaph by Ch'en Hsü 陳詡, written in 818, makes no reference to a Po-chang ch'ing-kuei. (See "T'ang Hung-chou Po-chang Shan ku Huai-hai ch'an-shih t'a-ming" 唐洪州百丈山故懷海禪師塔銘, Ch'üan T'ang wen 全唐文, 446, 4b-7a.)

15. For examples of the changes in the monastic institution, see Kagamishima Genryū, "Hyakujō ko shingi henka katei no ichi kōsatsu" 百丈古清規変化過程の一考察, KDBGKK, 25 (3/1967), pp. 1-13; Kozaka Kiyū 小坂機融, "Shingi hensen no teiryū" 清規変遷の底流 (1), SK, 5 (4/1963), pp. 123-29.

16. Ōkubo Dōshū, Dōgen zenji shingi, p. 8.

17. Dōgen zenji to inyō kyōten goroku no kenkyū, pp. 188, 262-63. Kagamishima finds one example from the Jih-yung ch'ing-kuei. The possibility (raised by Kondō Ryōichi 近藤良一, "Hyakujō shingi to Eihei shingi," IBK, 13, 1 [1/1965], pp. 297-300) that some of these passages originated in the Po-chang ch'ing-kuei cannot be totally disproven, but unless we accept the notion that the Ch'an-yüan ch'ing-kuei

was almost identical with Huai-hai's text, the absence of any quotation not wholly traceable to the latter should certainly make us suspicious.

18. See SBGZ zazen-shin, DZZ, 1, 97. The earliest record of such a text is probably the "Tso-ch'an chen" of Wu-yün Chih-feng 五雲志逢 (909-85), in chüan 30 of the Ching-te ch'uan-teng lu (T. 51, 459c-460a); but the later Ch'ih-men ching-hsün, which contains quite a few of these works, includes a "Tso-ch'an ming" attributed to Huai-jang's 懷讓 disciple Ta-te Ta-i 大德大義 (745-818). (T. 48, 1048b.) Other examples have been collected in the Ch'an-men chu-tsu-shih chieh-sung 禪門諸祖師偈頌 (ZZ, 2, 21, 454-92). The Chia-t'ai p'u-teng lu 嘉泰普燈錄 (ZZ. 2B, 10, 216a-b) includes a "Tso-ch'an i" by Fo-hsin Pen-ts'ai 佛心本才 (d.u.), a contemporary of Tsung-tse, but this work is more in the tradition of the tso-ch'an chen literature and gives very little concrete instruction in meditation practice.

19. See especially the passages on tso-ch'an in the Tao-hsin and Hung-jen sections of the Leng-chia shih-tzu chi 楞伽師資記 (T. 85 [2837], 1288c-1289a, 1289c-1290a), and passages in the Hsiu-hsin yao-lun 修心要論, attributed to Hung-jen (Tsui-shang-sheng lun 最上乘論, T. 48 [2011], 377-79, especially 378a-b, 379a). Many other texts of the early school, of course, from the Erh-ju ssu-hsing lun 二入四行論 to the Liu-tsu t'an-ching 六祖壇經, deal with the question of meditation, but rarely are they

explicit on the actual procedures for its practice. For a descriptive bibliography of the Tun-huang materials on Ch'an meditation, see Tanaka Ryōshō 田中良昭, "Tonkō zenshū shiryō bunrui mokuroku shokō" 敦煌禅宗資料分類目録初稿, KDBGKK, 29 (3/1971), pp. 1-18; 32 (3/1974), pp. 30-49; 34 (3/1976), pp. 1-24.

20. See, e.g., the famous criticisms of meditation by Shen-hui in the Nan-yang ho-shang t'an-yü 南陽和尚壇語 (Hu Shih 胡適, Shen-hui ho-shang i-chi 神會和尚遺集, rev. ed. [Taipei: Hu Shih Chi-nien Kuan, 1970], pp. 229ff, esp. 239), and in the Ting shih-fei lun 定是非論 (ibid., pp. 286ff); and by Hui-neng in the Liu-tsu t'an ching (T. 48, 338bff). We should bear in mind that the distinction here between the meditation teachings of the Tung Shan and Southern traditions is not always as sharp as is sometimes maintained; see, e.g., Tao-hsin's remarkable "sudden" doctrine in the Leng-chia shih-tzu chi, T. 81, 1287b.

21. Cf. Lin-chi's famous criticism of such monks, Lin-chi lu 臨濟錄, T. 47 (1985), 501a23. We may recall that in the Liu-tsu t'an ching itself, in his final words to his disciples, Hui-neng advises them to continue the practice of tso-ch'an, just as they did when he was alive. (T. 48 [2007], 345a20-21.) Ma-tsu is said to have constantly practiced tso-ch'an (and to have been chided by his teacher for it; see Ching-te ch'uan-teng lu, T. 51, 240c18ff); and his disciple Hui-hai 慧海 (d.u.), a strong exponent of sudden awakening, described tso-ch'an as the fundamental practice

of Buddhism (Tun-wu ju-tao yao-men 頓悟入道要門, ZZ. 2, 15, 420c14-15). The "Ch'an-men kuei-shih" makes reference to long periods of tso-ch'an in the monasteries following Po-chang's rules. (T. 51, 251a13.) For further examples of meditation practice among early advocates of the Southern tradition, see Shiina Kōyū 椎名宏雄, "Nanshū no zazen kan to sono tokushoku" 南宗の坐禪觀とその特色, SK, 13 (3/1971), pp. 140-43.

22. Ta fo-ting ju-lai mi-yin hsiu-cheng liao-i chu-p'u-sa wan-hsing shou-leng-yen ching 大佛頂如來密因修證了義諸菩薩萬行首楞嚴經, T. 19 (945), 146-53. This work is now generally assumed to be of Chinese origin. (See Mochizuki Shinkō, Bukkyō kyōten seiritsu-shi ron 仏教経典成立史論 [1946; repr., Tokyo: Hōzōkan, 1978], pp. 493-508; Paul Demiéville, Le Concile de Lhasa [Paris: Impremerie Nationale de France, 1952], pp. 43-52, n. 3.) Sekiguchi Shindai 関口真大 suggests that the reference here is to the earlier Śūraṅgama-samādhi-sūtra (Shou-leng-yen san-mei ching 首楞嚴三昧經 [T. 642]), translated by Kumārajīva (Tendai shikan no kenkyū 天台止觀の研究 [Tokyo: Iwanami Shoten, 1969], p. 323); but this text, while containing a discussion of Māra, does not provide explicit information on his obstructions of meditation. Kagamishima, Zen'en shingi, p. 282, appears to have the two sūtras confused.

23. Hsiu-hsi chih-kuan tso-ch'an fa-yao 修習止觀坐禪法要, T. 46 (1915). This work in one (or two) chüan,

summarizes Chih-i's earlier, and much longer, *Shih ch'an po-lo-mi tz'u-ti fa-men* 釋禪波羅蜜次第法門 (*T*. 1916; see Sekiguchi, *Tendai shō shikan* 天台小止觀, Iwanami bunko 33-309-3 [Tokyo: Iwanami Shoten, 1974], pp. 203-07). *T*. 1915 is based on the vulgate version; another, widely variant text, entitled *Lüeh-ming k'ai-meng ch'u-hsüeh tso-ch'an chih-kuan yao-men* 略明開矇初學坐禪止觀要門, is preserved in Japan. For a study and comparison of all extant versions, see Sekiguchi, *Tendai shō shikan no kenkyū* 天台小止觀の研究 (1954; repr., Tokyo: Sankibō Busshorin, 1961). The *Hsiao chih-kuan* has been translated into Western languages several times, most recently by Lu K'uan Yü, in *The Secrets of Chinese Meditation* (1964; repr., New York: Samuel Weiser, 1969), pp. 111-56.

24. For a summary of the contents of the *Hsiu-cheng i*, see Kamata Shigeo 鎌田茂雄, *Shūmitsu kyōgaku no shisōshi-teki kenkyū* 宗密教学の思想史的研究 (Tokyo: Tōkyō Daigaku Shuppankai, 1975), pp. 499-521.

25. Hence, it is not clear that Tsung-tse actually consulted the *Hsiu-cheng i*. Sekiguchi assumes that the *Tso-ch'an i* was based on Tsung-mi rather than Chih-i (*Tendai shikan no kenkyū*, p. 324), but he does not offer any evidence for this. For the *Hsiu-cheng i*'s relationship to the *Hsiao chih-kuan*, see Sekiguchi, *Tendai shō shikan no kenkyū*, pp. 29-32. Tsung-mi also quotes extensively from the *Hsiao chih-kuan* in his *Yüan-chüeh ching ta-shu ch'ao* 圓覺經大疏鈔, *ZZ*. 1, 14, 454aff; see Sekiguchi, op. cit., p. 36. Ibid.,

pp. 285-302, provides a table comparing the "Cheng hsiu" 正修 section of the Hsiao chih-kuan with the Hsiu-cheng i, the Ta-shu ch'ao, and Chih-i's Ch'an-men yao-lüeh 禪門要略 (ZZ. 2, 4, 315-17); Kamata, Shūmitsu kyōgaku, pp. 524-604, gives a similar table of the first three of these works covering the first and third divisions of the Hsiu-cheng i.

26. See, e.g., Kumārajīva's Ch'an-pi yao-fa ching 禪祕要法經: "Spread your nisīdana in a quiet place. Sit with the legs fully crossed. Arrange your robes. Straighten your body and sit erect. Bare your right shoulder. Place your left hand on your right hand. Close your eyes and press your tongue against your palate. Stabilize your mind, make it stationary, and do not let it disperse. . . ." (T. 15 [613], 243b.) For an overview of the literature and history of meditation in early Chinese Buddhism, see Mizuno Kōgen 水野弘元, "Zenshū seiritsu izen no Shina no zenjō shisō-shi josetsu" 禅宗成立以前のシナの禅定思想史序説, Komazawa daigaku kenkyū kiyō 駒沢大学研究紀要, 15 (3/1957), pp. 15-54. More recently, Prof. Mizuno has described the concrete features of meditation practice as it appears in the Chinese vinaya literature: "Ritsuzō ni arawareta zen no jissen" 律蔵に現れた禅の実践, in Sekiguchi Shindai, ed., Shikan no kenkyū 止観の研究 (Tokyo: Iwanami Shoten, 1975), pp. 51-71.

27. See Sekiguchi, Tendai shikan no kenkyū, pp. 343-44, for a list of early texts affected by the Hsiao chih-kuan.

28. It should be noted that even in those passages which find parallels in the Hsiao chih-kuan, Tsung-tse's text remains original both in its language and the focus of its treatment. Prior to the publication of Sekiguchi's table of the texts, Yamauchi Shun'yū 山内舜雄 did his own comparison and analysis of the Hsiao chih-kuan and Tso-ch'an i; he also concludes that Chih-i's influence is largely limited to the description of meditation posture. ("Zazen-gi to Tendai shō shikan" 坐禪儀と天台小止觀, SK, 8 [4/1966], pp. 29-50.)

29. Compare, e.g., the following with T. 46, 465c14-19:

SBGZ zazen-gi

1. あしのさきおのおのももとひとしくすべし參差なることえざれし
2. 両手かくのごとくして身にちかずけておくなり

Bendō-hō

3. 左右搖振七八箇

Such passages, it must be admitted, may reflect reliance on an oral tradition based on the Hsiao chih-kuan rather than reference to the text itself.

30. Earliest reference to the Hsiao chih-kuan in Japanese records appears in 740. (See Sekiguchi, Tendai shō shikan no kenkyū, p. 103. Sekiguchi believes that the work was introduced in 736 by the Chinese monk Tao-hsüan 道璿 [Dōsen, 702-60], a student of the well-known Northern Ch'an master P'u-chi 普寂. It should be noted that Tao-hsüan, who is usually credited with the transmission of the Hua-yen teachings, introduced Fa-tsang's Ta-sheng ch'i-hsin lun i-chi

大乘起信論義記, which also contains a description of <u>tso-ch'an</u> taken from the <u>Hsiao chih-kuan</u> [<u>T</u>. 44 (1846), 283a-b].) Most of the major works of Chih-i, including the <u>Mo-ho chih-kuan</u> and <u>Hsiao chih-kuan</u>, were among the books brought to Japan by the famed <u>vinaya</u> master Chien-chen 鑑眞 (Ganjin, 688-763), who arrived in 754. (See <u>Tō dai oshō tōsei-den</u> 唐大和尚東征傳, <u>Yūhō-ki shō</u> 遊方記抄, <u>T</u>. 51 [2089], 993a.)

31. Dōgen himself, of course, studied on Hiei-zan and was obviously familiar with the Tendai meditation literature and practice. In addition to his use of the <u>Hsiao chih-kuan</u>, elsewhere in his writings he quotes from the <u>Mo-ho chih-kuan</u> and the <u>Fa-hua san-mei ch'an-i</u> 法華三昧懺儀 (<u>T</u>. 1941), attributed to Chih-i, and he frequently relies on Chan-jan's 湛然 (711-82) <u>Chih-kuan fu-hsing</u> 止觀輔行 (T. 1912).

By at least the tenth century, Tendai meditation practice had transcended the confines of the monastic centers to become a feature of the new, more popular forms of later Heian Buddhism. The meditation known as <u>jōgyō zanmai</u> 常行三昧, or <u>nenbutsu zanmai</u> 念佛三昧, is often given as one of the major sources for the practices of the Jōdo <u>hijiri</u> 聖 movements of this period; and among those who left Hiei-zan to train and teach independently there were many, like Zōga 増賀 (917-1003) and Shōkū 性空 (910-1007), known for their devotion to the Hokke 法華 and <u>ichigyō</u> 一行 meditations. The popularization of Tendai practice during this time is reflected in the writings attributed to the famous

prelate Genshin 源信 (942-1017), which include not only works on the *nenbutsu zanmai* but also a textbook on *zazen*. (*Shikan zazen-ki* 止觀坐禪記, Dai *Nihon bukkyō zensho* 大日本仏教全書, 31, 267-72. This work is also based in part on the *Hsiao chih-kuan*.)

In considering the Heian knowledge of *zazen*, we must not overlook the importance of the *mikkyō* 密教 practice of *a-ji kan* 阿字觀, prevalent in both the Tendai and Shingon traditions. While the object of contemplation in this practice distinguishes it from both the Tendai *shikan* and the *zazen* practices of the Zen school, much of the basic method is the same. (See, e.g., *Wu-wei san-tsang ch'an-yao* 無畏三藏禪要, *T*. 18 [917], 944c; *A-ji kan yōjin kuketsu* 阿字觀用心口訣, *T*. 77 [2432], 145a.)

32. As with many other Sung texts, it is not certain when and by whom Tsung-tse's writings were introduced. Unfortunately, the Ch'an pilgrims of the late Heian, unlike some of their more scholastic predecessors, do not provide us with catalogues of the texts they collected in China. Hence, our knowledge of the circulation of Ch'an materials in Japan during the early years of the Zen movement there is severely limited, and for many of the works referred to by Yōsai and Dōgen himself we cannot be sure how widely they were known. Clearly this problem is a major obstacle to a correct historical understanding of Dōgen's teachings, and it deserves more attention than it has yet received.

33. *T*. 80 [2543], 12a14-17. Interestingly enough, as

Prof. Yanagida has noticed, this text is not based on the Ch'an-yüan ch'ing-kuei manual used by Dōgen but on the abbreviated version found in the Ta-tsang i-lan, a work Yōsai relies on elsewhere in his treatise. Why this is so, of course, we cannot say; but since Yōsai's visits to China took place between the composition of the Ch'an-yüan ch'ing-kuei and its revision in 1202, his text provides additional evidence that the work may not originally have included the Tso-ch'an i. (See Yanagida's additional notes to the Kōzen gokoku ron, in Ichikawa Hakugen 市川白弦, et al., Chūsei zenke no shisō 中世禅家の思想, Nihon shisō taikei 日本思想大系, 16 [Tokyo: Iwanami Shoten, 1972], p. 398; and his "Yōsai to Kōzen gokoku ron no kadai" 栄西と興禅護国論の課題, ibid., pp. 471-76.)

34. In fact, he quotes the text in his SBGZ. (See Kagamishima, Dōgen zenji to inyō kyōten goroku no kenkyū, p. 232.)

35. We may recall that Dōgen quotes in the FKZZG both the Hsin-hsin ming and the Cheng-tao ko, and that he revises the essay on the basis of his work on Hung-chih's Tso-ch'an chen.

36. See, e.g., Yamauchi, "Zazen-gi to Tendai shō shikan," pp. 44-50; Yokoi Kakudō, "FKZZG go-shinpitsu bon ni tsuite" (2), SK, 12 (3/1970), pp. 19-30. Prof. Sekiguchi's position is, of course, only one element in this Tendai scholar's general argument for the T'ien-t'ai influence on the Ch'an tradition, an argument he has been making since

his *Tendai shō shikan no kenkyū* (1954) and *Daruma daishi no kenkyū* 達摩大師の研究 (1957; rev. enl. ed., Tokyo: Shunjūsha, 1969. He has reviewed many of the points of that argument in *Tendai shikan no kenkyū*, pp. 271-81.) The opposing position is equally an expression of the more general view of Sōtō scholars that Dōgen's Zen was radically different from (and superior to) the Sung form of Ch'an. (See, e.g., Kagamishima Genryū's influential "Dōgen zenji to Sōchō zen" 道元禅師と宋朝禅, *Nihon bukkyō gakkai nenpō* 日本仏教学会年報, 26 [1960], pp. 57-72; repr. in Kagamishima, *Dōgen zenji to sono monryū* 道元禅師とその門流 [Tokyo: Seishin Shobō, 1961], pp. 7-27.)

THE TEACHINGS OF THE *FUKAN ZAZEN-GI* (I): THE TENPUKU TEXT AND THE PRACTICE OF *ZAZEN*

The text of the *FKZZG* falls into three fairly distinct, and roughly equal, sections. Of these, as we have seen, it is the middle section which deals with the actual technique of meditation. Here Dōgen is largely content to follow Tsung-tse, albeit with some significant omissions and additions. In contrast, the introductory section is wholly new; and in his conclusion, though he retains much of the structure and some of the phrasing of the *Tso-ch'an i*, Dōgen again departs from Tsung-tse to elaborate his own understanding of Zen. It is these latter two sections, then, which most clearly bear Dōgen's stamp and most sharply distinguish the *FKZZG* from a simple meditation manual.

Though the *FKZZG* is not only a practical guide to the techniques of *zazen*, it is such a guide; and while it is not particularly original in its presentation of these techniques, this in itself does not, of course, detract from its value as a manual or as a source for understanding Zen meditation as it was practiced in thirteenth century China and Japan. On the contrary, as we have emphasized in the preceding chapter, their close correspondences with the *Tso-ch'an i* place the practical instructions of the *FKZZG* within an

established meditation tradition and give them a universality not necessarily shared by some of Dōgen's more theoretical interpretations of the practice. To these interpretations we shall turn in due course; but before taking up those passages of the FKZZG which differ markedly from the Tso-ch'an i, let us here briefly summarize the central section of the work, in which Dōgen explains how to do zazen. This will give us some sense, not only of the concrete features of his zazen practice itself, but also of the way in which these features are related to the earlier tradition. We shall generally keep to the Tenpuku version here, which is closer to Tsung-tse, and shall reserve consideration of the Kōroku edition for later.[1]

Broadly speaking, the practical explanation of zazen describes two sorts of activities: (1) seated meditation itself, traditionally treated under the three aspects of body, breath and mind; and (2) certain ancillary practices preceding and following the meditation. On the latter, as we have seen, Chih-i's T'ien-t'ai hsiao chih-kuan offers several chapters, dealing with the cultivation of spiritual attitudes conducive to meditation and with concrete mental and physical preparations for its practice. The corresponding section in the FKZZG, like that of the Tso-ch'an i from which it is taken, is extremely abbreviated and retains only a few of Chih-i's recommendations. We are told simply to seek quiet quarters, be moderate in our eating habits, and avoid worldly activities.[2]

Dōgen next proceeds to the explanation of zazen posture: one is to sit erect on a thick cushion in the classic yogic cross-legged position (kekkafu-za 結跏趺坐, or the variant half cross-legged position, hankafu-za 半跏趺坐), with hands in the traditional meditation mudrā of the dharma-dhātu (hokkai jōin 法界定印); the tongue rests against the palate and the lips and teeth are closed; the eyes are kept open. Though they omit some of its details, all these instructions are quoted directly from the Tso-ch'an i. As we have earlier noted, Tsung-tse's own text here corresponds closely to much of the Hsiao chih-kuan's section on regulation of the body when entering meditation (ju-ch'an t'iao-shen 入禪調身, T. 46, 465c7ff), though he occasionally disagrees on certain basic features of the practice. On the important topic of breathing, to which Chih-i devotes a separate section, the FKZZG follows Tsung-tse in recommending simply that it be regulated.[3]

In the above instructions the FKZZG has covered, in a very cursory manner, the first two of the Hsiao chih-kuan's three types of regulation upon entering meditation, that of the body and breath. One would expect the discussion to turn next to the third, the regulation of mind (t'iao hsin), defined by Chih-i as the avoidance of either torpor (ch'en 沈, laya) or agitation (fu 浮, audatya). As an antidote for the former, the Hsiao chih-kuan recommends that the meditator fix his attention on the tip of his nose; if the mind becomes agitated, he is to focus his awareness on his

abdomen. Surprisingly, these fundamental, and widely employed, techniques for achieving mental balance in _zazen_ are completely ignored by both Tsung-tse and Dōgen. Instead, together they skip directly to the main meditation itself, or what in Chih-i would correspond to the practice proper (_cheng-hsiu_):

> As soon as a thought occurs, be aware of it. As soon as you are aware of it, it will vanish. Remaining for a long period forgetful of objects (_bōen_ 忘緣), you naturally become unified (_ippen_ 一片). This is the essential art of _zazen_.

This passage has no parallel in the _Hsiao chih-kuan_, the "Cheng-hsiu" chapter of which is devoted to a simplified account of the traditional practices of _śamatha_ and _vipaśyanā_. Rather, the _Tso-ch'an i_ and _FKZZG_ appear to be drawing here on a basic doctrine of the early Southern school of Ch'an. In his _Nan-tsung ting shih-fei lun_ Shen-hui is recorded as teaching:

> Good friends, for those engaged in the practice, whenever a thought occurs to the mind, it is aware of it; when that mental occurance (_ch'i hsin_ 起心) has passed, the awareness vanishes of its own accord. This is no-thought (_wu-nien_ 無念).[4]

Similarly, in the _Ch'an-yüan chu-ch'üan chi tu-hsü_ 禪源諸詮集都序 of Shen-hui's later interpreter Tsung-mi we find:

> If one is aware that all characteristics (hsiang 相) are empty, the mind will naturally be without thought (wu-nien). As soon as a thought occurs, be aware of it; as soon as you are aware of it, it will cease to exist. The profound gate of the practice lies precisely here. Therefore, although one cultivates myriad practices, he makes no-thought the essential one (tsung 宗).[5]

It will be noticed that in these early Southern texts the practice described here is associated with the school's doctrine of wu-nien, or no-thought, a doctrine used to repudiate the meditation teachings of the Northern tradition. According to the Southern masters, wu-nien is not the elimination of thought (chüeh-nien 絕念) produced by meditative trance, but the pure, uninhibited power of knowledge (chih 知) which is the original nature of the mind. Even though thoughts continue to occur, as long as the mind is simply aware of them as they arise and disappear, it is functioning in accordance with its original nature and is undefiled by thought. Any effort, we are told, to stop thought or to control the mind by focusing it on an object impedes this natural function and leads to attachment to the object.[6]

The teaching of wu-nien, of course, is a feature of the Southern school's famous doctrine of sudden awakening. As such, it cannot be interpreted simply as a meditative

practice in the ordinary sense, for the sudden doctrine explicitly rejects all such spiritual techniques (fang-pien 方便, upāya) for the attainment of bodhi. Rather, no-thought is intended, in part at least, as a description of the originally enlightened state of the mind, a state we are invited simply to recognize and affirm. At the same time, it is clear from the examples we have quoted here that wu-nien is also something to be put into practice through detached awareness of the stream of one's thoughts, and that the perfection of such awareness represents the unification of consciousness in a form of samādhi.[7] To this extent, its novel interpretation notwithstanding, we seem to have in this Southern school teaching a version of the venerable Buddhist practice of mindfulness (nien 念, smṛti).[8]

Whatever the early Ch'an interpretation of this meditation practice, how Tsung-tse and Dōgen justified the zazen method they recommend here we cannot say, for neither pauses to explain it. Rather, they simply state that it is the "dharma gate of ease and joy" (anraku hōmon 安樂法門) and that when rightly practiced it will relax the body, invigorate the spirit, and make one calm, pure and joyful. The enlightened practitioner, we are told, takes to it "like a dragon to the water or a tiger to the mountains." Finally, both texts conclude their instructions on the practice with the admonition -- again based on the Hsiao chih-kuan (T. 46, 466b) -- that after completing zazen one should arise slowly and calmly and at all times should try to maintain the power

of samādhi.

In the above discussion of zazen method the FKZZG adds almost nothing in the way of concrete instructions to the description provided by the Tso-ch'an i. On the contrary, it is even shorter and more schematic than Tsung-tse's own abbreviated account and limits itself only to the most basic features of the practice.[9] Clearly Dōgen does not intend this discussion to provide a full explanation of his meditation method; and, indeed, if one looks at his later manuals and elsewhere in his writings, he will discover here and there material that supplements the rather meager fare offered here.[10] This discovery serves not only to remind us of Dōgen's debt to the techniques of the earlier tradition but to call our attention to a basic problem confronting any attempt at a reconstruction of his own zazen practice from the FKZZG.

We may recall that at the conclusion of his "Senjutsu yurai" Dōgen remarks that his meditation manual represents merely "a substitute for what is received in the mind transmission." Implicit here is a warning -- made explicit elsewhere -- that a full understanding of the Zen practice described in the manual is dependent on direct contact with a Zen master.[11] That meditation should be studied, not simply from books, but in consultation with a teacher is, of course, a constant refrain of Buddhist contemplative tradition; indeed, as we have earlier noted, so dominant is the emphasis on oral instruction in this tradition that explicit

manuals such as the Hsiao chih-kuan and Tso-ch'an i represent something of an anomaly. Hence, even where we have such a manual, we must approach it with caution, bearing in mind that it may well represent merely the tip of an iceberg of meditation lore submerged in the oral tradition. This point is so obvious, perhaps, that it need hardly be emphasized; what does need to be emphasized it seems -- because it has generally been ignored -- is the corollary that we cannot argue from the FKZZG's silence on a given technique that Dōgen did not, in fact, recommend its use. What concrete meditation instructions passed between Dōgen and his students in what he calls the "mind transmission" we simply do not know, but it is clear that there is more to his zazen than we have in the FKZZG. This fact obviously raises difficult questions for the traditional account of Dōgen's meditation practice, and we shall need to refer to it again below.

Although for the most part in the central section of his Tenpuku FKZZG Dōgen is content to follow Tsung-tse's description of zazen quite closely, here and there he does see fit to revise the text and to introduce some interesting comments of his own. The first of these occurs in the passage on preparatory practices, in connection with the admonition to discontinue secular activities. As we have indicated, this teaching is taken from a list of five conditions for meditation given in the Hsiao chih-kuan; there Chih-i defines it as the avoidance of four types of activity: occupational pursuits, social intercourse with laymen, arts

and sciences, and scholarship. (T. 46, 463b) Tsung-tse at this point substitutes his own advice: be unified in body and mind, whether in action or at rest. Presumably this is intended to indicate a state of concentrated attention which allows one to maintain his detachment from extraneous, or "worldly," influences even when he is in the midst of action.[12] Dōgen follows Tsung-tse's lead here but goes on to develop the psychological sense of renunciation still further.

> Cast aside all involvements and discontinue all affairs. Do not think of good or evil; do not deal with right or wrong. Halt the revolutions of mind, intellect, and consciousness; stop the calculations of thoughts, ideas, and perceptions.

Whatever the exact sense of Dōgen's recommendation here to stop thinking, we should probably not understand this passage as teaching a technique of meditation in which the mind is brought to a halt. It must be remembered that we are here dealing with the preparation for zazen; and given its context, it would seem best to view the passage as a Zen comment on the true meaning of suspending worldly affairs -- viz., that worldliness is within, and that the meditator must relinquish, not only his external ties to the secular world, but also those internal mechanisms which lead him to experience and believe in such a world. At the same time, of course, it serves as a warning, often repeated by Ch'an and Zen masters, that the practice is not to be approached

through the understanding but begins with a suspension of our ordinary ways of thinking. In a closely related passage in the Gakudō yōjin-shū Dōgen remarks that, despite the many dedicated practitioners of Buddhism, few have actually awakened to the way; the reason for this is that

> It is extremely difficult to regulate the mind. Intelligence is not a primary factor; learning is not primary; mind, intellect, and consciousness are not primary; thoughts, ideas, and perceptions are not primary: without employing any of these, one must regulate body and mind and by this enter the buddha-mārga. . . . When the two characters of action and rest are perfectly clear and do not arise, this is the regulation [of body and mind]. (DZZ, 2, 257.)

In the final sentence here we seem to have the connection between Tsung-tse's advice to maintain a unified consciousness in both action and rest and Dōgen's recommendation to give up thinking: regulation of the mind (chōshin 調心), or single-minded attention to the practice, occurs when the true characters (sō 相, lakṣaṇa) of action and rest are known not to arise -- that is, are seen to be empty. Presumably, then, it is because our ordinary thinking does not see them in this way that it represents an obstacle to the practice and must be suspended. In any event, we have here come well beyond Chih-i's original suggestion that the

meditator avoid involvement in the secular world; we have come, it would seem, to the very gates of the Ch'an world of no-thought and sudden awakening. Indeed, our FKZZG passage is strongly reminiscent, both in content and language, of a teaching on sudden awakening attributed to Po-chang Huai-hai.

> A monk asked, "What is the sudden awakening teaching of the Mahāyāna (ta-sheng tun-wu fa-men 大乘頓悟法門)?" Po-chang replied, "You should first stop all involvements and discontinue all affairs. Do not bear in mind, do not think of, any dharma, whether good or bad, mundane or transmundane. Cast aside body and mind and set them free.[13]

A somewhat similar -- though rather more problematic -- innovation occurs in the Tenpuku text at the very end of the central section we are considering here, in reference to the notion of samādhi power. According to Tsung-tse's version, after the practitioner has come out of samādhi, he should use techniques (fang-pien) to maintain his concentration (ting-li 定力, samādhi-bala) at all times, in order to facilitate the development of this power. Dōgen retains the basic passage on maintaining samādhi power here, but he substantially alters its context. He omits Tsung-tse's references to "emerging from samādhi" and "employing upāya"; hence, his

passage ignores the distinction between the state of samādhi achieved in zazen and the cultivation of concentration practiced outside that state. He also omits Tsung-tse's suggestion that the goal of this practice is the development of one's samādhi power. Instead, he offers his own highly abstract and extremely obscure commentary.

> In studying and investigating it, you transcend its higher workings, without a basis to rely on; in verifying and letting go of it, you are obstructed by the self, wherein you are never impeded. This is the full realization of the way.[14]

Whatever this passage may mean, it clearly implies that samādhi power is not, as is usually understood, simply the power of concentration on the object of meditation; rather, it apparently involves a state of spiritual freedom in which the practitioner is not dependent upon, nor arrested by, anything.[15] Moreover, it would seem that the maintenance of this state is not a practice intended to improve one's ability to enter into samādhi but is an end in itself. Indeed, it is said to represent the complete fulfillment of the Buddhist way (dō shi jūsei 道之十成, a characterization which, if we are to take it literally, can only indicate a state of enlightenment. Thus, if this interpretation is correct, the FKZZG passage is identifying the perfection of samādhi power with the perfection of bodhi, and we seem to have here an intimation of Dōgen's famous doctrine of the identity of

zazen and enlightenment. As we have already noted in the preceding chapter, this doctrine is a key to Dōgen's criticism of Tsung-tse, and it forms one of the basic themes developed in the *Kōroku* revision of the *FKZZG*.

When we turn from the central section of the *FKZZG* to its introductory and concluding sections, we move from the description of *zazen* proper to its interpretation; and, for the most part, we leave Tsung-tse's *Tso-ch'an i* behind. To be sure, as we have noted, quite a few of Dōgen's passages here, especially in his conclusion, develop ideas presented in the Chinese manual. Still, beyond these literary embellishments there is much that is new; and in what is new two themes in particular seem worthy of note as indicative of the *FKZZG*'s characteristic approach to Zen and of the gulf that separates this approach from that of Tsung-tse. The first of these concerns the attitude with which one is to undertake the practice.

In the *T'ien-t'ai hsiao chih-kuan* Chih-i introduces his discussion of *tso-ch'an* with the following remarks:

> The practitioner beginning to study *tso-ch'an* and intending to cultivate the *dharmas* of the Buddhas of the ten directions and three realms should first produce the great vow to lead all beings to liberation and to seek the supreme enlightenment of a Buddha.[16]

It is undoubtedly with this passage in mind that

Tsung-tse begins his own manual of <u>tso-ch'an</u>:

> The Bodhisattva who studies <u>prajñā</u> should first arouse the thought of great compassion, make the great vows, and exactly cultivate <u>samādhi</u>. Vowing to save sentient beings, he should not seek liberation for himself alone.

Here Tsung-tse, like Chih-i, seeks to emphasize at the very outset the Mahāyāna nature of his meditation practice: <u>samādhi</u> is to be cultivated against the background of the vow to win perfect enlightenment and bring about the salvation of all beings. Hence, he addresses his treatise to "the Bodhisattva who cultivates <u>prajñā</u>." Tsung-tse does not pause to discuss the nature of this <u>prajñā</u> nor its bearing on meditation but proceeds directly to his description of the practice. Yet it is precisely here, in the interpretation of how the Mahāyāna wisdom teaching should inform the Bodhisattva's understanding of meditation, that the early masters of Tsung-tse's Ch'an tradition established their characteristic approach to Buddhism. And it is with this approach that Dōgen begins his own treatise:

> Fundamentally speaking, the basis of the way is perfectly pervasive; how could it be contingent on practice and verification? The vehicle of the ancestors is naturally unrestricted; why should we expend sustained effort? Surely the whole being

> is far beyond defilement; who could believe in a method to polish it? Never is it apart from this very place; what is the use of a pilgrimage to practice it? And yet, if a hair's breadth of distinction exists, the gap is like that between heaven and earth; once the slightest like or dislike arises, all is confused and the mind is lost.

Here in both content and language the FKZZG is clearly harking back to the original message of the Ch'an school: "fundamentally speaking," enlightenment is inherent and is not the result of religious endeavor; and yet, as long as one clings to the objects of discrimination, he fails to recognize this fact.[17] Like many of the early masters of Ch'an, Dōgen does not emphasize the altruistic aspiration of the Bodhisattva but focuses instead on the individual's quest for enlightenment. Again like those masters, he points to discrimination -- "reflection" (gigi 擬議), "deliberation" (shōryō 商量) -- as the most serious obstacle to that quest, calling upon the meditator to "reverse the intellectual practice of investigating words and chasing after talk." One should, rather, "directly accede" (jikige jōtō 直下承當) to the true Buddhist understanding by taking "the backward step" (taiho 退歩) of insight into the original nature of his own mind. When he does so, we are told, all attachments to body and mind will drop away (shinjin datsuraku 身心脱落) of their own accord, and the

inherently enlightened mind (<u>honrai</u> <u>menmoku</u> 本來面目) will be manifest.[18]

In all this there is little new; except for a turn of phrase here and there, it could have been said by virtually any Ch'an master from the mid-T'ang on. Almost certainly it could have been said by Tsung-tse, but it was not; and this is worthy of note, for what is significant here is the explicit association of the Ch'an doctrine of sudden awakening with the advocacy of <u>zazen</u>. Whatever reticence some of the originators of this doctrine may have shown in recommending the cultivation of meditation as a means to Buddhist awakening, the final sentence of the <u>FKZZG</u> introduction is unambiguous: "If you want such [a state, in which the original nature of the mind becomes apparent], urgently work at <u>zazen</u>." For Dōgen <u>zazen</u> is par excellence the way to the realization of enlightenment; indeed, in his characteristic formulation of the matter, <u>zazen</u> itself is that realization. On this important point we shall have to say more below.[19]

A second major theme, and one which we have already had occasion earlier to mention, emerges in the <u>FKZZG</u>'s repeated references and allusions to the tradition of the Ch'an school. In terms of style, as we have seen, whereas Tsung-tse is content to present his teachings in straightforward, unadorned language, Dōgen's text is self-consciously literary and strives -- one might even say strains -- throughout to emulate the classic literature of Ch'an. Hence, the very language of the <u>FKZZG</u> is steeped in that literature,

and the reader cannot but be reminded at every turn of the sectarian affiliation of its author. Yet beyond this, Dōgen goes out of his way to explicitly associate his meditation teaching with the Chinese Ch'an tradition and to encourage his reader to enter into that tradition. In his introduction he praises the spirit of Bodhidharma's meditation. In his conclusion he alludes to the first transmission of Ch'an to Mahākāśyapa and to Bodhidharma's transmission to Hui-k'o; he refers to the one Buddha dharma passed down through the Patriarchs to the Five Schools of Ch'an; he calls on his reader to follow the practice of Po-chang and participate in the tradition of Shao-lin.

On all these points Tsung-tse's Tso-ch'an i is totally silent; except for one or two passing references to Ch'an, his text makes no mention of the school nor allusion to its history. For Tsung-tse, of course, and his Sung readers Ch'an was a long-established tradition and a tradition, moreover, not in serious competition with other Buddhist schools. Like many of his contemporaries, in fact, Tsung-tse himself did not limit his interests to Ch'an but wrote as well on the popular Ching-t'u system.[20]

Needless to say, in Kamakura Japan the situation was quite different. There the religious scene had long been dominated by other schools of Buddhism. Moreover, these Japanese schools were not merely spiritual or dogmatic traditions but distinct ecclesiastical bodies, with independent economic status and all the political consciousness that

status implies. Particularly in Dōgen's day, faced as they were with the economic and political uncertainties attendant upon the decline of the Heian aristocracy and the rise of new centers of temporal power, these established churches inevitably reacted strongly -- and in some cases violently -- to the proliferation of schismatic movements and the introduction of new Buddhist traditions from the mainland.

Zen, of course, was such a new tradition, and under these circumstances it is small wonder that Dōgen, like other Buddhist leaders of the period, succumbed to the heavy atmosphere of sectarian struggle. He had before him the recent examples of men like Hōnen and Shinran who had been persecuted and driven into exile for their teachings. Closer to home, his own predecessor in Zen Dainichi-bō Nōnin 大日房能忍 (d.u.), a man who was indirectly to have considerable impact on Dōgen's teachings, had similarly run afoul of the dominant Tendai organization; in 1194 his Zen teaching was proscribed, and soon thereafter he was assassinated by his powerful relative Taira no Kagekiyo (d. 1196).[21] Even Yōsai, whom Dōgen considered his spiritual forebear, despite the fact that he remained within the Tendai fold, was forced to defend his Zen teachings against charges of heresy and anti-nomianism.[22] In such an atmosphere it was probably impossible to advocate Zen Buddhism without being obliged to defend it. In fact, we know that some ten years after his composition of the FKZZG Dōgen himself came under pressure from Hiei-zan, and there is evidence that on this

occasion, like Yōsai before him, he sought to justify his position with an apologia addressed to the court.[23] Whether or not he was embroiled in sectarian politics in 1233 we cannot say, but his final advice in the FKZZG clearly suggests that he already felt the need to defend his teachings against criticism: "Do not trouble yourself over winds that offend the ear nor be upset by sounds of the beating tongue."

Dōgen's sectarianism was by no means merely defensive. He had studied in China, a fact of which he seems to have been fiercely proud, and was one of the few active teachers of his day personally familiar with the new Buddhism of the continent. He was privy to a whole range of Sung literature on Ch'an, a literature not yet widely disseminated in Japan and composed in a new language largely unfamiliar to Japanese Buddhists; his FKZZG and, indeed, the entire corpus of his writings reflect Dōgen's fascination with that language and his delight in having made it his own.[24] Most importantly, he felt himself the sole Japanese inheritor of the wisdom of the Patriarchs, a wisdom he saw as identical with the true dharma of the Buddha himself.

It has long been a commonplace among interpreters of Dōgen that he transcended sectarian affiliation and rejected the notion of Zen as a distinct Buddhist school. This is, in fact, what Dōgen himself tells us. Particularly in his SBGZ butsudō 佛道 he offers a lengthy and impassioned criticism of the appellation "Zen school" (zenshū 禪宗). This term, he maintains -- with considerable historical

accuracy -- appears only in the later literature; it is not used by the early Chinese Patriarchs, not to mention the Indian Buddhist masters. Its adoption is the result of a misunderstanding of Buddhism, and its currency in China is evidence of the decline of the dharma there. There is no such thing, properly speaking, as a "Zen school"; there is only "the way of the Buddha" (butsudō 佛道, "the great way correctly transmitted from Buddha to Buddha" (butsubutsu shōden no daidō 佛佛正傳の大道).[25]

However catholic such opinions may appear on the surface, just below that surface there moves a sectarian spirit so bold that it would lay sole claim to the true teaching of the Buddha. What Dōgen objects to here is the notion that Zen represents one transmission among many; rather, there is only one true transmission of the dharma, and it passes from Śākyamuni through Bodhidharma and the Chinese Patriarchs to Dōgen himself. The obvious corollary to this, of course, is that those traditions which stand outside this transmission stand outside the true dharma. This is a radical doctrine indeed, and we should recognize that its implications for the other Japanese Buddhist schools are easily as devastating as any of the pronouncements of that most famous of Japanese sectarians, Nichiren.

Unlike Nichiren, Dōgen prudently avoids dwelling on the obvious implications of his notion of the true dharma and, for the most part, eschews explicit denunciation of the established Buddhist schools. Nevertheless, it is clear from

both his words and his deeds that he fully intended to establish his own brand -- or, as he would say, the Buddha's own brand -- of Buddhism as a separate and institutionally independent religion. Exactly when and how he developed such an intention we do not know, but the sectarian consciousness behind it is already reflected in the Bendō-wa and Tenpuku FKZZG, and its historical realization finds expression in the founding of Kōshō-ji. It is small wonder, then, that Dōgen eventually provoked the wrath of Hiei-zan, and that ultimately he was forced to abandon Kōshō-ji and take refuge in Echizen.

Whatever implicit doctrinal and real political conflicts Dōgen may have had with the other Japanese Buddhist schools, it would seem from his writings that his true enemies lurked not in Heian but across the sea in China. These were the Sung teachers of the Ch'an school, those teachers who, as the Butsudō has informed us, had misunderstood the true dharma and whose misunderstandings were now threatening to take root in Japan. It is against these rivals -- close in Buddhist affiliation but safely distant in time and space -- that Dōgen directs his most open and virulent attacks. They do not yet appear in the Tenpuku FKZZG nor, generally speaking, in any of Dōgen's early works, but toward the end of his stay at Kōshō-ji and during his first years in Echizen they emerge as a major factor in the development of his teaching. With this development we move from the Tenpuku FKZZG to the revised Kōroku text.

NOTES

1. The following discussion refers to the section of the Tenpuku text beginning 夫參禪者 and ending 乃道之十成也.

2. The first and third are taken from Chih-i's list of five conditions (wu-yüan 五緣) for meditation discussed in the "Chü-yüan" chapter of the Hsiao chih-kuan: purity in keeping the precepts, provision of food and clothing, retirement to a quiet place, cessation of worldly involvements, and contact with good friends. Chih-i defines a "quiet place" (ching-ch'u 靜處) as any of the three types of environments traditionally considered appropriate for meditation: a mountain fastness, an isolated forest retreat, and a pure monastery. (T. 46, 463b.) The FKZZG uses the term jōshitsu 靜室 (śūnyāgāra; literally, "empty dwelling"), which seems to carry a somewhat narrower sense than the more common ching-ch'u and indicates any appropriate dwelling other than under a tree or at a forest hermitage. (See Shan chien lü p'i-p'o-sha 善見律毘婆沙, T. 24 [1462], 746a.)

Moderation in food and drink corresponds to the first of the five kinds of regulation given in the "T'iao-ho" chapter: food, sleep, body, breath, and mind. Tsung-tse and Dōgen here mention only moderation in the amount consumed,

but Chih-i adds a warning against eating improper foods (465b); and elsewhere Dōgen himself records a list of such foods proscribed by his master, Ju-ching (Hōkyō-ki, DZZ, 2, 373-74). Tsung-tse also recommends the second member of Chih-i's list, the regulation of sleep, but for some reason Dōgen omits it. In his Japanese zazen-gi, however, he gives what appears to be a commentary on this topic by encouraging his reader not to waste time but to throw himself into zazen practice as though brushing a fire from his head. This remark may reflect Chih-i at T. 46, 465c4.

The topic of abandoning worldly activities will be taken up again below.

3. At T. 46, 465c Chih-i recommends expelling all the "foul air" (chou ch'i 濁氣) through the mouth before settling into meditation; at 466a he distinguishes four types of breathing -- audible (feng 風), gasping (ch'uan 喘), rough (ch'i 氣), and fine (hsi 息) -- the first three of which are to be avoided. Although the Tso-ch'an i and Tenpuku FKZZG ignore this material, in his later manuals Dōgen reintroduces the practice of expelling the breath (kanki issoku 欠氣一息) and in his Bendō-hō gives a list of six types of breathing to be avoided: audible (fū 風) or gasping (sen 喘), long (cho 長) or short (tan 短), slow (kan 緩) or rapid (kyū 急).

The Hsiao chih-kuan (465c12) speaks of meditation on the traditional Indian cord bench, (shen ch'uang 繩牀; for which, see Shih sung lü 十誦律, T. 23 [1435], 77a). Some

variation of this chair seems to have been in use among Ch'an masters in the T'ang (see Lin-chi lu, T. 47, 504a19), although in the more formal monasteries the ordinary monk presumably sat (as he still does in Japan today) on the long dias (ch'ang lien ch'uang 長連床), reported to have been a feature of Po-chang's meditation hall (see "Ch'an-men kuei-shih," T. 51, 251a11). By Sung times Tsung-tse recommends simply spreading a thick mat (tso-wu 坐物). The use of such a padded mat, often folded so as to provide a slightly raised seat, is still common among meditators in China, Korea, and Japan. For his part, Dōgen goes on to suggest that a cushion (futon 蒲團) be placed on top of the mat, and in his Japanese zazen-gi he carefully describes its positioning. How widely such a cushion was used in Sung China is not clear, but it appears in T'ang sources. (See Lin-chi lu, T. 47, 504b6.)

On the positioning of the legs in meditation, while all three authors agree that in the half cross-legged position (adhaparyaṅka) the left foot is placed on the right thigh, for the full position (paryaṅka), whereas Chih-i recommends placing the right foot above the left, Tsung-tse and Dōgen opt for the left foot on top. The form given by Chih-i is sometimes referred to as the chi-hsiang position 吉祥坐; Tsung-tse's form, as the hsiang-mo position 降魔坐. (See I-ch'ieh ching ying-i 一切經音義, T. 54 [2128], 353b.) Of these it is the former, both in the full and partial postures, which seems to have been more prevalent in India:

it is recommended, e.g., by Buddhapāli in the Hsiu ch'an yao chüeh 修禪要訣 (ZZ. 2, 15, 418b) and by Śubhakarasiṃha in the Wu-wei san-tsang ch'an yao (T. 18, 944c). In any case, both styles appear to have been widely practiced in China; and, in fact, the Ta-tsang i-lan version of the Tso-ch'an i departs from Tsung-tse here to recommend Chih-i's chi-hsiang position. (Hōbō sōmokuroku, 3, 1305b2.)

On the question of what to do with the eyes, Tsung-tse recommends that they be kept slightly open (wei k'ai 微開); he goes on to refer to eminent monks of the past who sat with eyes open and to cite his own teacher Fa-yün, who criticized those who sat in meditation with eyes closed. In his Hsiao chih-kuan Chih-i says, "Close your eyes just enough to cut off the light from outside" (ts'ai ling tuan wai kuang erh i 纔令斷外光而已 ; T. 46, 465c27). Sekiguchi Shindai has suggested that this statement does not recommend completely closing the eyes, and that there is no real difference between Tsung-tse and Chih-i on this point (Tendai shikan no kenkyū, pp. 338-42); but after some experiment, it remains difficult to understand how one could shut out the light without fully closing his eyes. Rather, as is suggested in the Ch'an-men k'ou-chüeh 禪門口訣, Chih-i's point here would seem to be that one should close his eyes gently, without pressing the lids together (wu ling yen-lien ta chi 勿令眼瞼大急 ; T. 46 [1919], 581b6). This would put Chih-i squarely in the tradition of most Indian Buddhist meditators and in what Fa-yün calls "the

ghost cave of the black mountain" (ho-shan kuei-k'u 黑山鬼窟). We may note in passing that the Hōkyō-ki records Ju-ching as saying that experienced meditators, not susceptible to drowsiness, may sit with eyes closed, but beginners should keep their eyes open. (DZZ, 2, 386.)

4. Hu Shih, Shen-hui ho-shang i-chi, pp. 308-09. See also Shen-hui's Nan-yang ho-shang t'an yü: "If a deluded thought arises, there is awareness, when both awareness and delusion have gone, this is the non-abiding mind of the original nature." (Hu Shih, op. cit., p. 249.)

5. T. 48 (2015), 403a4ff; see also Tsung-mi's so-called Zenmon shishi shōshū zu 禪門師資承襲圖, ZZ. 2, 15, 436c. This passage describes the practice of what Tsung-mi considers the highest form of Ch'an, that which "directly reveals the nature of the mind" (chih hsien hsin hsing 直顯心性). In his statement here that no-thought follows naturally from the awareness of emptiness, Tsung-mi reveals the continuity of the Ch'an practice of wu-nien with the earlier meditation tradition. Compare, e.g., the Hsiao chih-kuan's description of "śamatha through comprehension of the truth" (t'i-chen chih 體眞止; as opposed to śamatha through fixation on an object [hsi-yüan shou-ching chih 繫緣守境止] and śamatha through control of the mind [chih-hsin chih 制心止]):

> Thereafter, while he is sitting [the practitioner] should with right thought reflect on the true

character of all dharmas. . . . All good, bad, and neutral dharmas, all sāsrava dharmas, all kleśas, all saṃskṛta dharmas of the three worlds, the causes and effects of saṃsāra -- all these exist in dependence on the mind. . . . If the practitioner knows that the mind is without any nature, how can there be any reality to the dharmas? If the dharmas are not real, they are false; and if he knows them to be false, they are empty and without substance. Being empty and without substance, they cannot be grasped. If he does not grasp them, the mind of deluded thoughts wang-nien hsin 妄念心) ceases; and when the mind of deluded thoughts ceases, he is quiescent and unconditioned (wu-wei 無為). This unconditionedness is the original source of all dharmas. If he rests his mind in this original source, it is without defilement; and if his mind is without defilement, then all karmic activity of saṃsāra ceases. When the karmic activity of saṃsāra ceases, this is itself nirvāṇa. Therefore, the [Pan-chou san-mei 般舟三昧] Sūtra says, "The mind does not know the mind; the mind does not see the mind. When the mind gives rise to ideas (hsiang 想), this is ignorance; when it is without ideas (wu-hsiang 無相), this is nirvāṇa." (Translated from Sekiguchi's edition, Tendai shō shikan no kenkyū, pp. 339-40.)

6. See, e.g., *Nan-yang ho-shang t'an yü*, Hu Shih, *Shen-hui ho-shang i-chi*, p. 239; *Liu-tsu t'an ching*, *T.* 48, 338c-339a; *Ch'an-yüan chu-ch'üan chi tu-hsü*, *T.* 48, 402c-403a. Tsung-mi classifies advocates of traditional meditation (such as Shen-hsiu 神秀) as the lowest form of Ch'an, those who teach the stopping of delusion and the cultivation of the mind (*hsi*-*wang* *hsiu*-*hsin* 息妄修心). Like T'ien-t'ai Chih-i, he says, they emphasize techniques for entering *samādhi*, teaching one to "avoid the hustle and bustle of the world and dwell in a quiet place, regulate body and breath, sit in silent meditation with the legs crossed, the tongue pressed against the palate, and the mind fixed on a single object." (Ibid., 402b-c.)

7. Shen-hui, in the *Ting shih-fei lun*, identifies *wu-nien* with the *i*-*hsing* *san*-*mei* 一行三昧 (*ekavyūha*-*samādhi*), in which the meditator is said to have the one mark (i.e., emptiness) of the *dharma*-*dhātu* as his object. (Hu Shih, op. cit., p. 308. See also *Liu-tsu t'an ching*, *T.* 48, 338b.)

8. Though it is not emphasized in the *Hsiao chih-kuan*, a form of mindfulness meditation is, of course, one of the four forms of *samādhi* (*ssu*-*chung* *san*-*mei* 四種三昧) recommended in the *Mo-ho chih-kuan* -- that described as "neither walking nor sitting" (*fei*-*hsing* *fei*-*tso* 非行非坐):

> The master Nan-yüeh called this [practice] "following one's own intellect" (*sui* *tzu* *i* 隨自意) -- that is, to practice *samādhi* with the arising of

the intellect (manas). The Pañcaviṃśati refers to it as "the samādhi of awareness of the intellect" (chüeh i san-mei 覺意三昧) -- that is, to be conscious of, and clear about, the progression of the intellect. . . . Awareness (chüeh) here means illumination (chao-liao 照了, prakāṣa); intellect (i) means the mental dharmas (hsin-shu 心數, caitasika). . . . The practice is, whenever a mental dharma arises, to reflect on, and contemplate it, without attending to its development -- its origin or conclusion, where it comes from or where it goes. (T. 46, 14b-c; see also Chih-i's Chüeh-i san-mei 覺意三昧, T. 46 [1922], 621-27.)

Chih-i's interesting misinterpretation of the term chüeh-i (bodhyaṅga) here is explained at some length in Neal Donner, "The Great Calming and Contemplation of Chih-i," (Ph.D. dissertation, University of British Columbia, 1976), pp. 252-53, n. 249. Historically, the source of Shen-hui's own technique of wu-nien is more likely in the kind of mindfulness practice recommended in the Hsiu-hsin yao lun. (See T. 48 [2011], 379a.)

9. Note Dōgen's omission of Tsung-tse's passages on adjusting sleep, stretching and swinging the torso, avoiding physical strain, relaxing the abdomen, and so on.

10. In the Kōroku FKZZG, for example, note the additional information on deep breathing and swinging the body

before meditation; in the Japanese Zazen-gi, note the passages on preparation of the place of meditation, on the placement of the cushion, and on the position of the hands and feet; in the Bendō-hō, see the new material on breathing. Many of these directions correspond to instructions given in the Hsiao chih-kuan. Elsewhere, see, for example, the discussion of counting the breaths (sūsoku 數息) and breathing from the "field of cinnabar" (tanden 丹田) in the EHKR (DZZ, 2, 96), and the various instructions on meditation in the Hōkyō-ki -- especially at DZZ, 2, 386, 387, where we are told, among other things, that according to the method correctly transmitted by the Buddhas and Patriarchs, when one sits in meditation he should place his mind in his left palm.

11. See, e.g., Bendo-wa, DZZ, 1, 731, 734.

12. Note the Hsiao chih-kuan on regulating the body: "Even when you are not in meditation -- whether you are walking or standing, moving or still -- you should be fully conscious of all your activities, both in motion and at rest." (T. 46, 465c.)

13. Ching-te ch'uan-teng lu, T. 51, 250a. Generally speaking, all of the expressions in Dōgen's passage represent variations on the basic Ch'an message of no-thought. "Do not think of good or evil" (fu shi zen aku 不思善悪), borrowed from Tsung-tse's text, is a popular Ch'an injunction probably first appearing in Shen-hui's Nan-yang ho-shang t'an yü. (Hu Shih, Shen-hui ho-shang i-chi, p. 236;

Tsung-tse's version follows the form attributed to Hui-neng at Ching-te ch'uan-teng lu, T. 51, 236a20). "Do not deal with right or wrong" (maku kan zehi 莫管是非) is from a line by Li Tsun-hsü 李遵勗 (d. 1038). (Chia-t'ai p'u teng lu 嘉泰普燈錄 ZZ. 2B, 10, 155a14; quoted at Tenzo kyōkun, DZZ, 2, 300.)

"Mind, intellect, and consciousness" (shin i shiki 心意識 in technical writing, of course, represent citta, manas, and vijñāna respectively. Where they appear in this combination, they often seem to carry the general sense, "(deluded or discriminative) consciousness"; as such, they may be understood as roughly equivalent to the notion of nien 念 (as in wu-nien 無念. Cf. Demiéville, Le Concile de Lhasa, p. 99, n. 2; p. 100, n. 1. Demiéville translates, "la connaisance mentale"). See, e.g., the Erh ju ssu hsing lun: 但有心分別計校自心現量者皆是夢 . . . . 此心意識忘想夢裏智慧 . . . . 若識心寂滅無動念處是名正覺 . (Suzuki Daisetsu 鈴木大拙, Zen shisō-shi kenkyū 禅思想史研究 2 [1951; repr., Suzuki Daisetsu Zen-shū 鈴木大拙全集, vol. 2 (Tokyo: Iwanami Shoten, 1968)], p. 145.) The Buddha is said to be devoid of hsin i shih 無心意識 (Wen-shu-shih-li wen ching 文殊師利問經, T. 14 [468], 494a-b), and nirvāṇa to be apart from them 離心意識 (Erh ju ssu hsing lun, Suzuki, Zen shisō-shi kenkyū 2, p. 155). For the recurrent Ch'an admonition to approach Buddhism free from hsin i shih, see, e.g., Nan-yang ho-shang t'an yü, Hu Shih, Nan-yang ho-shang i-chi, p. 232:

夫於解脫者離心意識. . . .是為宴坐; Lien-teng hui yao, ZZ. 2B, 9, 401a: 直須離心意識參.

The meaning of nen sō kan 念想觀, translated here as "thoughts, ideas, and perceptions," is somewhat ambiguous. Taken individually, these terms can refer either to ordinary mental activities (smṛti, saṃjñā, vicāra, etc.) or to meditative practices (anusmṛti, saṃjñā, vipaśyanā, etc.). Their use in combination is best known from the Ta-chih-tu lun's quotation of the "Prajñā-pāramitā-stotra": "La Prajñāpāramitā/Vrai Dharma, exempt de méprise./ Pensée, notion, vue (nien hsiang kuan 念想觀) sont écartées/ Les éléments du discours sont détruits." (T. 25, 190b20-21; tr. in Étienne Lamotte, Le Traité de la Grande Vertu de Sagesse, vol. 2 [Louvain: Institut Orientaliste, 1949] p. 1061.) Here the three terms together probably translate vikalpa, and it is undoubtedly in this sense of discriminative cognition (fen-pieh 分別) that we should understand them in the FKZZG. We should note, however, that in his use of the Ta-chih-tu lun stotra Chih-i takes advantage of the terms' association with meditation (Chüeh i san-mei, T. 46, 626a29), and there may well be an undercurrent in our passage of the Ch'an criticism of traditional meditation practices.

14. A tentative translation. Jōkan 上關 ("higher workings") is undoubtedly an abbreviation of hsiang-shang kuan-li-tzu 向上關棙子, from Huang-po's 黄蘗 comment on Niu-t'ou Fa-jung 牛頭法融: 橫說竪說猶未知向上關棙子. (Ching-te ch'uan-teng lu, T. 51, 266c5; quoted at

EHKR, DZZ, 2, 26.) "Without a basis to rely on" (mu hon ka kyo 無本可據) comes from Yang-shan Hui-chi 仰山慧寂: 大地衆生業識茫茫無本可據. (Ching-te ch'uan-teng lu, T. 51, 283a22; quoted at SBGZ sanbyaku soku, DZZ, 2, 255; SBGZ sanjūshichi bon bodai bunpō 三十七品菩提分法, DZZ, 1, 506, etc.) The curious expression "obstructed by the self" (hi ji ge 被自礙) follows a pattern repeated in the Gakudō yōjin-shū: 被道礙兮當處明了被悟礙兮當人圓成矣 . . . . 夫學道者被道礙也被道礙者亡悟跡也. (DZZ, 2, 259-60; note also the Kōroku FKZZG's 被礙兀地.) This passage is probably one of the more self-conscious -- and least successful -- in the FKZZG; mercifully, Dōgen eliminated it in his Kōroku revision.

15. Note the somewhat similar description of the faculty of samādhi (ting-ken 定根, samādhīndriya) given in the Ta-chih-tu lun 大智度論:

> "[Le Bodhisattva] ne s'attache pas à la concentration, ne la savoure pas et ne s'y appuie pas. . . . Il joue en maitre avec toutes les extases et tous les recueillements. . . . Sans se conformer à la parole d'autrui, sans se conformer spécialement à tel ou tel recueillement, il y exerce sa maitrise en sort ou y entre sans obstacle." (T. 25 [1509], 204b-c; Lamotte, Le Traité de la Grand Vertu de Sagesse, vol. 3 [1970], pp. 1197-98.)

16. T. 46, 465b. This passage occurs in the vulgate version as the introduction to the "T'iao-ho" chapter, but it appears originally to have formed part of the discussion of śamatha in the "Cheng-hsiu" chapter. See Sekiguchi, Tendai shō shikan no kenkyū, pp. 150-51.

17. The opening sentence of this introduction alludes to the famous dialogue on practice and enlightenment (hsiu-cheng 修證) between Hui-neng and Nan-yüeh Huai-jang (for which, see the following chapter, n. 5); the third sentence recalls the verse on polishing the mirror of the mind attributed to Shen-hsiu by the author of the Liu-tsu t'an ching (T. 48, 337c); the fourth reflects the Cheng-tao ko in its phrase "never is it apart from this very place" (fu ri tōsho 不離當處 ; T. 48 [2014], 396b12; the fifth is a quotation from the Hsin-hsin ming (T. 48 [2011], 376b21-22).

18. The terms ni-i 擬議 and shang-liang 商量 appear frequently in Ch'an literature in senses somewhat different from "discrimination." The former, in the sense "to think of saying (or doing) something" expresses the hesitation of the student who is unable to produce a spontaneous response to a master's word or deed (e.g., Lin-chi lu, T. 47, 496b22, c7, etc.); the latter often indicates the give and take of Ch'an repartee (e.g., ibid., 500 c1). Dōgen tends to use both terms in a broader sense. See, e.g., SBGZ mujō seppō 無情說法, where they again occur together and mean something like "to [mistakenly] consider." (DZZ, 1, 399.)

"Direct accession" refers to an immediate accent to the

truth (see, e.g., *Yün-men kuang-lu* 雲門廣錄, *T*. 47 [1988], 546a4; *Pi-yen lu* 碧巖錄, *T*. 48 [2003], 188c26-27); it also -- especially in Dōgen -- bears the related sense "to succeed [to the *dharma*]." In the Gakudō *yōjin-shu* Dōgen defines it as follows:

> Accession (*jōtō*) is the direct verification of one's buddhahood with this very body and mind. In other words, without transforming the body and mind one has had up to now, to simply follow another in verifying [one's buddhahood] -- this is what is called "direct" (*jikige*), this is what is called "accession." (*DZZ*, 2, 260.)

The expression "investigating words and chasing after talk" (*jingon* *chikugo* 尋言逐語) is probably taken from *Yün-men kuang-lu*, *T*. 47, 545c22: 更欲蹋步向前尋言逐句求覓解會. "The backward step of turning the light and shining it back" (*ekō henshō shi taiho* 迴光返照之退步) combines two popular Ch'an expressions for the abandonment of external practices in favor of direct self knowledge. (See, e.g., "Shih-t'ou ho-shang ts'ao-an ko" 石頭和尚草庵歌, *Ching-te ch'uan-teng lu*, *T*. 51, 461c17: 迴光返照便歸來; *Yün-men kuang-lu*, *T*. 47, 546c2: 須退步向自己. Note Dōgen's use of these terms in his *Tenzo kyōkun*: "Ideas fly about like wild horses, and thoughts race around like forest monkeys. If you once make those horses and monkeys step back and reflect within [*taiho*

henshō], you will naturally be unified [ippen 一片].")
"The original face," of course, is a popular Ch'an expression for enlightenment, first attributed to Hui-neng: 不思不惡正與麼時如何是上座本來面目. (Liu-tsu t'an ching, Kōshō-ji 興聖寺 text, Nakagawa Taka 中川孝, Rokuso dankyō 六祖壇經, Zen no goroku, 4 [1976], p. 46.)

19. The Tenpuku text suggests here, and the Kōroku revision clearly relies on, a saying of Yün-chü 雲居: "If you want such a thing 欲得恁麼事, you must be such a man. Since you are such a man, why do you worry about such a thing?" (Ching-te ch'uan-teng lu, T. 51, 335c19; Dōgen devotes his SBGZ inmo to this saying.)

20. See his "Kuan-nien fo sung" 觀念佛頌 and "Hsi-fang ching-t'u sung" 西方淨土頌, Lo-pang wen-lei 樂邦文類, T. 47 (1969A), 219-20; "Ch'uan ts'an-ch'an jen chien-hsiu ching-t'u" 勸參禪人兼修淨土, Lung-shu ching-t'u wen 龍舒淨土文, T. 47 (1970), 283-84.

21. Honchō kōsō den 本朝高僧傳, Dai Nihon bukkyō zensho, 102, 273. Nōnin was the founder of the Nihon Daruma school; many of the members of this school eventually became the leaders of Dōgen's Zen community at Kōshō-ji.

22. It was such charges that led to his composition of the Kōzen gokoku ron. According to the Genkō shakusho 元亨釋書, Yōsai's Zen was associated in the minds of the authorities with that of the Daruma school, and in his treatise he is at pains himself to renounce the teachings of that school. (See Yanagida, "Yōsai to Kōzen gokoku ron no

kadai," pp. 467-68.)

23. This evidence comes from the Keiran shūyō-shū 溪嵐拾葉集 (T. 2410), which informs us that during the reign of Gosaga (1242-46) Dōgen defended his views in a petition to the throne entitled "Gokoku shōbō gi" 護國正法義. The official assigned to his case decided that Dōgen's views were those of a pratyeka-buddha, and his petition was denied. The text is quoted and discussed in Ōkubo, Dōgen zenji den no kenkyū, pp. 191-96.

24. Interestingly enough, in the SBGZ zuimon-ki Dōgen is recorded on several occasions as apologizing for his wide knowledge of Ch'an and other Chinese literature; he warns his listeners against studying books and claims that he himself has given up reading. (DZZ, 2, 447-48, 449-50.) Perhaps this is best interpreted as an example of his upāya-kauśalya. In any case, it is not surprising that he might have felt moved to apologize for the demands his many literary allusions and obscure Ch'an locutions must have placed on his students. Although Dōgen is usually grouped with the "popular" reformers of the Kamakura period, in fact most of his teachings -- at least as we have them -- must have been directed toward an elite few.

25. DZZ, 1, 376ff; see also Bendō-wa, DZZ, 1, 736; EHKR, DZZ, 2, 54. The use of the appellation ch'an-tsung 禪宗 seems to have begun sometime during the latter half of the eighth century. It appears probably for the first time in Ch'an literature in the Tun-wu ta-sheng cheng-li chüeh

頓悟大乘正理決 (Demiéville, *Le Concile de Lhasa*, planches 1, 2, 9); see Yanagida Seizan, *Shoki zenshū shisho no kenkyū* 初期禪宗史書の研究 (Kyoto: Hōzōkan, 1967), pp. 454-55.

THE TEACHINGS OF THE *FUKAN ZAZEN-GI* (II): THE *KŌROKU* TEXT AND THE THEORY OF *ZAZEN*

The *Kōroku* *FKZZG*, as we have seen, was composed a decade or more after the Tenpuku version. It is not surprising, therefore, that we find in it a more mature expression of Dōgen's writing. Generally speaking, the style has been somewhat refined and certain of the more exuberant and self-consciously literary passages of the earlier text have been omitted. Also omitted are several passages -- some of them quite important -- which had been taken over in the Tenpuku work from the *Tso-ch'an i*. In their place has been added some new material, emphasizing a doctrine and couched in a technical language familiar to us from the *SBGZ* and other of Dōgen's works written in the years separating the two versions of the *FKZZG*. Taken together, these revisions result in a text markedly different in tone from Tsung-tse's original and unmistakably bearing the characteristic stamp of Dōgen's own approach to Zen. While we need not -- and, indeed, cannot -- here consider all these various revisions, several passages are of particular interest as representative of both the language and the doctrine of Dōgen's mature meditation teachings.

In his *Tso-ch'an i*, in the course of describing the

method of tso-ch'an, Tsung-tse introduces some general remarks on the effects of meditation practice. Tso-ch'an, we are told, is "the dharma gate of ease and joy" (an-lo fa-men 安樂法門). Although if improperly practiced it can be injurious to the health, when correctly performed it will be beneficial for both body and mind. The enlightened man takes to it quite naturally; and even the ordinary, unenlightened man, if he simply gives himself over to the spirit of the practice, will find it easy. At the same time, the meditator should expect to face various demonic obstructions, which he can prepare himself for by reading their description in the Buddhist literature and overcome by maintaining right thought.

In the Tenpuku FKZZG Dōgen significantly abbreviates this passage, dropping the references to the possibility of illness, the practice of the unenlightened man, and the occurance of demonic obstructions.[1] In this way, his version tends to emphasize only the positive mental and physical effects of the practice. In his Kōroku revision, he goes considerably further and completely eliminates all discussion of the worldly benefits of zazen. Instead, he introduces a totally new perspective:

> Zazen is not the practice of dhyāna: it is just the dharma gate of ease and joy. It is the practice and verification of ultimate bodhi. The kōan is realized; nets and cages cannot get to it.

Gone here are Tsung-tse's gentle encouragements and practical warnings for the novice embarking on the meditative life; in their place is a strong doctrinal statement on the true nature of Zen meditation. Gone here are "peace and joy" in the sense of mental and physical pleasure; in their place are the peace and joy of nirvāṇa.[2] *Zazen* here is no longer presented as a psychophysical exercise for the improvement of body and mind, nor even for the attainment of Buddhist wisdom; it has itself become the actualization of complete enlightenment (*gūjin bodai shi shushō* 究盡菩提之修證). This last notion is, of course, a version of Dōgen's famous doctrine of the unity of practice and enlightenment (*shushō ittō* 修證一等), a doctrine first enunciated in the *Bendō-wa* and thereafter repeated in one form or another in many of his writings.[3] This doctrine is universally recognized as the very core of Dōgen's approach to Zen and is consistently held up as the theoretical hallmark of Japanese Sōtō Zen.

While we cannot here venture into the subtleties of Dōgen's Zen theory, it is worth recalling -- since this fact is often forgotten by his interpreters -- that his idea of the unity of practice and enlightenment is hardly an original one. In essence it is a restatement -- albeit an extremely interesting and important one -- of a corollary of the classical Ch'an teachings on no-thought and sudden awakening to which we have already referred. In the idiom of masters like Shen-hui, since perfect wisdom is the inherent activity

(yung 用) of the mind, true Buddhist practice consists solely in allowing the mind to function naturally without any attachment (wu-chu 無住). Hence, by definition such practice, generally identified with no-thought, is the practice of an enlightened mind. It is on the basis of this definition of practice, of course, that the Southern school criticizes the meditation teachings of the North as the product of delusion. Because true practice springs naturally from the enlightened consciousness, like that consciousness it must be "unconstructed" (wu-tso 無作), or free from the limited understanding and intentions of the practitioner.[4]

In a famous passage in the Bendō-wa Dōgen informs us that all the great Buddhist teachers, from Śākyamuni and Mahākāśyapa through Bodhidharma and the Sixth Patriarch, have recognized what he calls "enlightened practice" (shōjō no shu 證上の修). (DZZ, 1, 737.) Elsewhere in his writings he regularly refers to such practice as "undefiled practice and verification" (fuzenna no shushō 不染汚の修證), an expression he borrows from a saying attributed to the Sixth Patriarch's disciple Nan-yüeh Huai-jang 南嶽懷讓 (677-744) and which, it may be noted, he introduces into the SBGZ zazen-gi as a substitute for our passage: "Zazen is not the practice of dhyāna: it is the dharma gate of great ease and joy. It is undefiled practice and verification." Like the masters of the Southern school, Dōgen uses such notions to criticize those who fail to recognize

the wisdom inherent in meditation practice and, therefore, look upon it merely as an expedient means for the attainment of enlightenment.[5]

In its discussion of the renunciation of worldly affairs we have previously seen that the Tenpuku FKZZG elaborates Tsung-tse's interpretation with a recommendation to abandon all thinking. In the Kōroku version Dōgen goes on to add a further interesting admonition reflecting his doctrine of enlightened practice: "Do not intend to make a Buddha, much less be attached to sitting." These words, of course, derive from the well-known Ch'an dialogue between Ma-tsu Tao-i and Nan-yüeh Huai-jang on polishing a tile, and the passage is one of those taken over from Dōgen's SBGZ zazen-shin, where it is discussed in considerable detail.[6] In its context here in the FKZZG the allusion to this dialogue clearly serves to amplify the religious implications of the original topic of renunciation: in approaching zazen the meditator should surrender any notion that the practice is a means to enlightenment; still less should he understand it as limited to seated meditation. Such views, presumably, are the product of the discriminating mind and only impede the entrance into enlightened practice. As Nan-yüeh himself puts it at the conclusion of the dialogue, "If you are a sitting Buddha, this is killing the Buddha."

Nan-yüeh's remarks clearly seem intended to warn against attachment to both the physical form and the spiritual benefits of meditation, and Dōgen's own use of them in

the FKZZG certainly reflects this intention. Yet there is rather more to Dōgen's interpretation of Nan-yüeh than is suggested here. In his Zazen-shin, as is frequently the case in his commentaries on Ch'an material, he turns the entire dialogue, so to speak, on its head. There we are told that zazen is precisely the intention to make a Buddha, that seated ch'an is itself a seated Buddha, and that it is in fact the virtue of a sitting Buddha that he kills the Buddha.[7] These curious comments seem to point toward an aspect of Dōgen's notion of enlightened practice that gives it, for all its continuity with the earlier tradition, its own particular focus.

Like the masters of the Southern school, Dōgen draws from the unity of practice and enlightenment the conclusion that true practice must be beyond the machinations of the discriminating mind of the practitioner. Yet he also draws another conclusion, perhaps less emphasized in China, that true enlightenment must be put into practice. Unlike those Ch'an teachers who emphasize the spontaneous, unintentional character of practice and tend to reduce it -- at least in theory -- to a sudden return to, or recognition of, the original nature of the mind (chien-hsing 見性), Dōgen prefers to stress what might almost be called the intentionality of enlightenment and to interpret Buddhahood as the ongoing commitment to make a Buddha.

In his conclusion to the Tenpuku FKZZG he remarks that success in the practice of zazen does not depend upon the

mental abilities of the meditator; the reason is that

> If you let go of the six senses, you see and turn the whole path (*kenten zendō* 見轉全道); if you do not produce a single thought, you sit and cut off the ten directions (*zadan jippō* 坐斷十方).

Here again Dōgen is clearly echoing classical Ch'an doctrine: meditation practice is simply non-attachment and no-thought, and this in itself is enlightenment. In his *Kōroku* revision, however, he substitutes the following:

> Single-minded exertion (*sen'ichi kufū* 專一功夫) is itself pursuit of the way (*bendō* 辦道). Practice and verification are by nature undefiled. Advancement [to enlightenment] (*shukō* 趣向) is just an everyday affair.

In this version while the unity of practice and enlightenment remains constant, the emphasis seems to have shifted from abandonment of discrimination to wholehearted participation in the practice. In his *SBGZ gyōbutsu igi* 行佛威儀 Dōgen identifies undefiled practice and verification with what he calls "the practicing Buddha" (*gyōbutsu* 行佛), who fully carries out the observances of the Buddhist lifestyle (*igi* 威儀, *anri* 行履). This lifestyle, we are told, is "a Buddha practicing Buddhahood" (*butsu gyōbutsu* 佛行佛), "a Buddha making a Buddha" (*butsu sabutsu* 佛作佛).[8] Similarly, in his introduction to the

SBGZ gyōji he waxes quite eloquent on the undefiled religious activities or "performances" (gyōji 行持) of the Buddhas and Patriarchs. It is these performances that make the Buddhas and Patriarchs what they are; indeed, they make possible the very existence of the universe. These same performances are said to be our own religious acts. (DZZ, 1, 122-23.)

We have come quite close to edge of our interest here, and we shall leave to the Kyoto philosophers the yawning abyss of metaphysics beyond. What is of more immediate importance for us in this theory of Buddhist practice is that, whatever Nan-yüeh may have felt about tso-ch'an, for Dōgen it is precisely as a "seated Buddha" that one most fully recapitulates the enlightened activity of the Buddhas and Patriarchs. In his introduction to the FKZZG he reminds his readers of Śākyamuni's meditation under the Bodhi tree and of Bodhidharma's sitting before a wall; in his conclusion to the Kōroku text he goes on to claim that throughout the history of Buddhism from India to China all the Patriarchs "devoted themselves only to sitting (taza 打坐)."[9] Through the practice of zazen, then, we "accord with the bodhi of all the Buddhas and succeed to the samādhi of all the Patriarchs."

A similar historical argument appears frequently in Dōgen's writings. In the Bendō-wa, zazen is called "the true gateway to the buddha-dharma (buppō no shōmon 佛法の正門), because it is through zazen that all Buddhas of the three times and all Patriarchs of India and China have

attained the way (tokudō 得道). (DZZ, 1, 732-33.) In the SBGZ zanmai ō zanmai 三昧王三昧 Dōgen points out that the Buddha sat in meditation (kafu za 結跏趺坐) under the Bodhi tree, that he passed myriad kalpas in seated meditation, that he taught the dharma while in seated meditation; this practice he passed on to his disciples and taught to gods and men alike: it is the "mind seal correctly transmitted by the Seven Buddhas" (shichibutsu shōden no shin'in 七仏正伝の心印). This same seated meditation was practiced by Bodhidharma at Shaolin Ssu, and it represents the entirety of the vital lineage of the First Patriarch (shoso no myōmyaku 初祖の命脈). (DZZ, 1, 541.) In the EHKR we are told that "the true dharma correctly transmitted by the Buddha and Patriarchs is nothing but sitting (taza)," and that "sitting is the treasury of the eye of the true dharma, the subtle mind of nirvāṇa" (shōbō genzō nehan myōshin 正法眼蔵涅槃妙心) transmitted from Śākyamuni to Mahākāśyapa. (DZZ, 2, 77.)

While there may be some justification for the historical view that meditation practice, in one form or another, has always been the core discipline of the Buddhist monk, Dōgen's position here is clearly more radical. For him, just as Zen is not one Buddhist school among many by the entirety of the true dharma, so zazen is not merely one -- nor even the most important -- Buddhist practice but the very essence of the tradition. Moreover, it will be noticed in the above passages that it is not, as in early Ch'an, simply the calm

mental state of samādhi that is equated with the wisdom of the Buddhas but the concrete act of meditation. Particularly striking is the emphasis on the physical posture of sitting, an emphasis reflected in the FKZZG's own description of meditation practice. Here, as elsewhere in Dōgen's writings, it seems to be the act of sitting itself (taza), or cross-legged sitting (kekkafu za), which is identified with enlightened practice. In the Zanmai ō zanmai, in a remarkable commentary on the Ta-chih tu lun 大智度論, the position of kekkafu za itself is extolled as "the king of samādhis" and is directly identified with enlightenment.[10] In what is perhaps the most common, and undoubtedly the most famous, formulation of his zazen teaching, Dōgen equates what he calls "just sitting" (shikan taza 只管打坐) with the enlightened state in which "body and mind have dropped away" (shinjin datusraku).[11]

Whatever philosophical curiosities follow from the identification of the seated posture with the state of ultimate enlightenment, the general principle of which this is a specific application is probably already to be found in the Ch'an notion -- so popular in the Sung literature of the school -- that the deeds of the enlightened perfectly express the entirety of their enlightenment. Indeed, in his conclusion to the FKZZG Dōgen himself reminds us of the tradition that every act of the Ch'an master -- whether holding up a finger or beating a student -- represents the enlightened behavior of a Buddha, free from discrimination

and beyond understanding. What is new here is the particular focus on the act of sitting. Whether or not Dōgen himself was able to avoid the sort of attachment to the seated posture which he warns us against in the *FKZZG*, his emphasis on the spiritual significance of the physical act of sitting is remarkable; there is no doubt that it had a profcund effect on the later Sōtō tradition, in which the performance of *zazen* at times takes on a strongly ritual -- one might even say magical -- character.[12]

In his *Zanmai ō zanmai* Dōgen distinguishes three aspects of sitting: the sitting of the body (*shin* 身 *no taza*), the sitting of the mind (*shin* 心 *no taza*), and the sitting in which body and mind have dropped away (*shinjin datsuraku no taza*). (*DZZ*, 1, 540.) The reader may have noticed that in the above discussion we have been concerned almost exclusively with the first and third of these aspects and have said very little about the psychological content of *zazen* practice. This is not an oversight; in fact the *Kōroku FKZZG* gives almost no indication of what the meditator is supposed to do with his mind. It will be recalled that in the section of the Tenpuku text dealing with mental practice Dōgen exactly follows Tsung-tse in recommending that the practitioner simply be aware of each thought as it arises. This passage is totally absent in the *Kōroku* revision; instead we have what is perhaps the most interesting and problematic innovation of the work.

> Sit solidly, like a rock. Think of not-thinking. How do you think of not-thinking? Non-thinking. This is the essential art of _zazen_.

Here again we have material drawn from the _SBGZ zazen-shin_, in this case the words of the Ch'an master Yüeh-shan Wei-yen 藥山惟儼 (745-828):

> The Great Master Yüeh-shan Hung-tao was sitting [in meditation] when a monk asked, "What are you thinking, sitting so solidly (_wu-wu-ti_ 兀兀地)?"
> The master replied, "I am thinking of not-thinking (_pu ssu-liang ti_ 不思量底)."
> The monk asked, "How do you think of not-thinking?"
> The master said, "Non-thinking (_fei-ssu-liang_ 非思量)." (_DZZ_, 1, 90.)

Unfortunately, Dōgen gives us little concrete information on how one goes about non-thinking. In the _Zazen-shin_ his interest is primarily in the expression "solid sitting," a notion which he uses to launch an attack on those Ch'an monks, primarily of the Lin-chi tradition, who hold that seated meditation is not a necessary element in Ch'an practice. Elsewhere in Dōgen's writings as well, although Yüeh-shan's words occur quite frequently, there is little to enhance our understanding. In the _EHKR_, for example, we learn, hardly to our surprise, that non-thinking is neither the ordinary mind (_ushin_ 有心) nor unconsciousness (_mushin_

無心).[13] In the SBGZ sanjūshichi bon bodai bunpō non-thinking is identified with right thought (shō shiyui 正思惟, samyak-saṃkalpa), which in turn is said to consist in sitting until one has broken the meditation cushion (ha buton 破蒲團). (DZZ, 1, 511.) Here again the emphasis is on the act of sitting; what we miss is a description of the mental state, not to mention how one might go about achieving such a state.

The reluctance to describe a psychological method for the attainment of enlightenment we have already seen as a characteristic feature of the doctrine of sudden awakening. Particularly in Dōgen's system, where zazen is itself supposed to be enlightenment, we ought not, perhaps, be surprised that he offers us no concrete mental exercise for zazen practice. Indeed, the absence of such an exercise is regularly held up by his interpreters as a major virtue of his meditation. Zazen is not, as the FKZZG itself warns us, the traditional practice of dhyāna (shūzen 習禪); it is "just sitting" (shikan taza). To remain undefiled (fuzenna), it must remain beyond all conscious cultivation by the practitioner. Hence, the replacement of Tsung-tse's description of the meditation technique of no-thought with the highly mysterious injunction to think of not-thinking is sometimes hailed as a significant advance in Dōgen's zazen teaching; through this revision the Kōroku FKZZG eliminates all trace of ordinary shūzen and perfectly expresses the enlightened zazen of shikan taza.[14]

Earlier we have emphasized, and it should by now be quite apparent, that the _FKZZG_ is at least as much a literary and dogmatic treatise on _zazen_ as it is a manual for its practice. In terms of such a treatise it may be that Yüeh-shan's words add flavor to the style and, perhaps, a certain sophistication to the doctrine. At the same time, it must be admitted that the implications of these words for the actual practice of meditation are by no means clear, and that, as a consequence, their inclusion makes the _Kōroku FKZZG_ even more problematic than its predecessor as a source for understanding what sort of practical instructions Dōgen might have given his meditation students. Perhaps by necessity, almost certainly by design, the content of Dōgen's _shikan taza_ practice remains -- at least for the public record -- a mystery. Yet we need not conclude from this that _shikan taza_ had no content or that Dōgen had nothing more concrete to teach his disciples about meditation than what he gives us here. Sōtō doctrine notwithstanding, the question remains open whether, and in what sense, the actual practice of non-thinking represents a departure from Tsung-tse's meditation method. While we cannot hope to answer that question, we can point out two features of the notion of non-thinking which reveal the kind of difficulties facing any interpretation of the meditation practice of the _Kōroku FKZZG_. The first has to do with the meaning of the term itself; the second, with its historical context.

The word *ssu-liang* often has the quite general, and doctrinally neutral, meaning of "thinking about" something. Dōgen himself regularly uses *shiryō* 思量 in this sense in expressions such as, "You should think about this matter." Of greater relevance here is the term's more restricted sense, "reasoning," a sense in which it is often associated with "discrimination" (*fen-pieh* 分別) and usually carries a perjorative connotation. So, for example, in a well-known passage alluded to in the *FKZZG*, the *Saddharma-puṇḍarīka* speaks of the *dharma* known by the Tathāgata as "as not subject to understanding by the discriminations of thinking" (*fei ssu-liang fen-pieh chih so neng chieh* 非思量分別之所能解, *atarkāvacara*). (*T.* 9, 7a20.) Closely related to this sense is the notion of "grasping" or "being attached to" the object of thought. In particular, technically speaking, *ssu-liang* (*manyanā*) is identified as the basic activity of the *kliṣṭa-manas* and, hence, the source of ignorance.[15] The negative, *fei-ssu-liang*, then, refers to a state beyond reasoning and free of attachment -- in a word, to the state of enlightenment. In Bodhiruci's translation of the *Acintya-buddha-viṣaya-nirdeśa it is defined as the "unconditioned" (*wu-wei* 無為, *asaṃskṛta*) aspect of the "inconceivable realm of the Buddha (*pu-ssu-i fo ching-chieh* 不思惟佛境界, *acintya-buddha-viṣaya*), a realm devoid of language (*wen-tzu* 文字) and, therefore, inexpressable (*pu-k'e-shuo* 不可説).[16]

Obviously, there is little here to distinguish

fei-ssu-liang from the Ch'an notion of *wu-nien*, a state in which one is said to be free from "deluded thought" (*wang-nien* 妄念) or "false thought" (*hsieh-nien* 邪念) -- that is, from any cognition which grasps the sign (*hsiang* 相, *nimitta*) of its object and discriminates that object as a separate entity.[17] Indeed, in the parallel to the passage just referred to occurring in the *Ratnakūṭa*, Bodhiruci himself amends his translation from *fei-ssu-liang* to *wu-nien*.[18] More specifically, the notion of *fei-ssu-liang* as non-discriminatory cognition of the unconditioned exactly parallels the famous Ch'an definition of *wu-nien* as non-dualistic thought of suchness.[19]

None of this, needless to say, tells us a thing about *fei-ssu-liang* as a meditation practice, let alone what methods Dōgen might have recommended for thinking of not-thinking. What it does do is to show that the burden of proof is on those who would maintain that in its passage on non-thinking the *Kōroku* *FKZZG* recommends a kind of *zazen* somehow superior to that of Tsung-tse and the Tenpuku manual. If there is little to choose between the notions of *fei-ssu-liang* and *wu-nien*, then there would also seem little prima facie reason why the former could not be practiced through the same mindfulness meditation we have seen to be associated with the latter. To put this point more generally, whatever his theories on enlightened meditation, Dōgen's silence on the practical implications of non-thinking makes it impossible for us to distinguish in what, practically

speaking, his zazen differs from other forms of Zen meditation.

Having come this far, we shall close with one final heresy. If it is troubling to our traditional view of Dōgen's famous shikan taza to entertain the notion that it may have been no more than a doctrinally rarified version of the common Buddhist practice of mindfulness, still more troubling is the possibility that it may have involved some type of kōan meditation. Accounts of Dōgen's Zen, whether by apologists or otherwise, regularly draw a sharp distinction between his practice of just sitting and the kanna 看話 methods of the Rinzai school. For his apologists, of course, just sitting is "the profound practice of original verification" (honshō myōshu 本證妙修), a subtle meditative state undefiled by the dualistic striving for satori 悟 that characterizes kōan study; to his Rinzai critics, shikan taza is a form of mindless quietism -- of the sort sometimes called "dead trees and cold ashes" (koboku shikai 枯木死灰) -- devoid of the dynamism and spiritual insight that comes through application of the mind to the kōan.[20]

We need not trouble ourselves over the relative merits of these interpretations; obviously each distorts the position of the other. More significantly, both pretend a knowledge of the practice -- as opposed to the theory -- of Dōgen's shikan taza that we simply do not have; in the end, they probably teach us more about sectarian politics than

they do about Buddhist meditation. This political element, however, cannot be entirely overlooked; for it is present in Dōgen's own writings, and its presence there has, in fact, been influential in the interpretation of his zazen teachings. In our earlier discussion of the Karoku zazen-gi we noted in passing that Dōgen was extremely critical not only of Tsung-tse but of Sung dynasty Ch'an in general. Especially in his SBGZ texts from around the time he revised the FKZZG again and again he laments the decline of the dharma in China and lambasts the lawless "shavepates" (tokusu 禿子) and unlettered philistines (zuzan 杜撰) whose views dominated the contemporary Ch'an scene. It is, of course, the powerful Lin-chi tradition in particular which comes in for the most severe abuse. For whatever reasons -- and they are undoubtedly several -- Dōgen's vision of the true transmission narrows during this period to the Ts'ao-tung lineage, and in the end it is his own master, Ju-ching, alone of all contemporary teachers who fully understands the way of the Buddhas and Patriarchs.[21]

Unfortunately, we cannot pause here to explore this interesting development in Dōgen's thought. For our purposes it is enough to note that in his criticism of the Lin-chi school, while he singles out several teachers -- including Lin-chi I-hsüan himself -- he is particularly disdainful of the influential Ta-hui Tsung-kao 大慧宗果 (1089-1163). In his SBGZ jishō zanmai he indulges in an extraordinary argument ad hominum, going to considerable

pains to quote the Ta-hui wu-k'u 大慧武庫 and Chang Chün's inscription for Ta-hui to prove that he was not enlightened.[22] Since it is, of course, Ta-hui who is most closely associated with the use of the kung-an as a theme for meditation, it is often assumed that Dōgen's denunciation of him reflects a rejection of k'an-hua practice, and that shikan taza represents Dōgen's alternative to meditation on kung-an. In fact, however, there is little real evidence for this assumption.

Although Dōgen's criticisms of Sung Ch'an are many and varied, those that pertain directly to meditation are basically of two sorts, both of which can easily be inferred from our discussion of the Kōroku FKZZG. On the one hand, as we have already seen in the Zazen-shin, he attacks what he perceives to be a widespread tendency to look upon zazen as a means to enlightenment. Leaving aside the question of the historical justification for such criticism, its theoretical bases should be obvious from the foregoing discussion. What is important here is only the fact that the thrust of the criticism is theoretical and that it does not necessarily imply any judgement on particular forms of zazen practice. Only if we assume that k'an-hua meditation necessarily entails -- or rather, that Dōgen saw it as so entailing -- an understanding incompatible with his theory of enlightened practice can we use this criticism as evidence for Dōgen's rejection of k'an-hua methods. This is, to be sure, one of the assumptions of Dōgen's interpreters,

but there is almost nothing in Dōgen himself to support it. In fact, despite his extended critical treatment of Ta-hui, he nowhere directly refers to his meditation teachings; and in general, in his criticisms of Sung Ch'an he never explicitly mentions k'an-hua practice at all, much less associates it with the utilitarian approach he seeks to refute.[23]

The second sort of criticism, closely related to the first but with somewhat more practical implications, concerns the misidentification of zazen with the cultivation of trance states. We have seen that the Kōroku FKZZG explicitly holds that "zazen is not the practice of dhyāna," and a review of the various revisions in that text indicates that in general Dōgen sought to purge his manual of Tsung-tse's references to dhyāna and samādhi.[24] It is undoubtedly in part such references which prompted Dōgen's criticism of the Tso-ch'an i, and it may be that his substitution of Yüeh-shan's "non-thinking" for the earlier practice of mindfulness reflects an increased awareness of the possible association of this practice with a form of trance. This possibility is particularly apparent in the line, "remaining for a long period forgetful of objects (bōen 忘緣), you naturally become unified (ippen 一片)"; and, in fact, in his SBGZ tashin tsū 他心通 of 1246 he warns against the practice of "cutting off thoughts and forgetting objects" (zetsuryo bōen 絶慮忘緣). (DZZ, 1, 589.) In a similar vein, in his Zazen-shin he criticizes the authors of the Ching-te ch'uan-teng lu and Chia-t'ai p'u-teng lu for

admitting into their Ch'an histories texts which treat zazen as the practice of "putting a stop to thoughts and congealing in tranquility" (sokuryo gyōjaku 息慮凝寂). (DZZ, 1, 97.)[25]

It need hardly be emphasized that such criticisms of mental vacuity and inertia do not have as their object the sort of k'an-hua practice recommended by Ta-hui. They are, of course, precisely the kinds of criticisms that Ta-hui himself levels at the Ch'an of "silent illumination" (mo-chao 默照禪) advocated by the Ts'ao-tung master Hung-chih Cheng-chüeh 宏智正覺 (1091-1157). Like the early Ch'an masters, Dōgen and Ta-hui agree that meditation is not intended to bring about the cessation of thought (chüeh-nien) and submersion in tranquility but must be vitally active (huo-p'o-p'o-ti 活鱍鱍地) and filled with insight.[26]

If Dōgen's criticisms of Sung Ch'an do not rule out the possibility that he himself employed some form of the k'an-hua practice popular in China, this does not of course mean that he did. Still, there is no doubt that he was very strongly influenced by the Sung interest in the kung-an. Most of his study in China was with masters associated with Ta-hui's lineage, a lineage deeply involved with the kung-an literature; and Dōgen's own teaching is couched in the language of, and filled with allusions to, that literature.[27] Whether or not the tradition is true that he copied out the Pi-yen lu just prior to his return to Japan from China, it is clear that he made regular use of this famous kung-an collection by Ta-hui's teacher, Yüan-wu K'o-ch'in.[28] In

obvious imitation of Ta-hui's Cheng-fa yen-tsang 正法眼藏 (ZZ, 2, 23, 1-78), Dōgen collected three hundred kōan cases in his own SBGZ; he devoted much of his life's work to the commentary on these and other kōan, and indeed, his Japanese SBGZ can be read as a textbook for their study. There seems little doubt that Dōgen saw in the kōan material the major vehicle for the training of his disciples, and he repeatedly urges them to devote themselves to a thorough investigation of the significance of these sayings of the ancients.

When we bring a sense of Dōgen's deep involvement with the kōan literature to the FKZZG, we cannot help but be struck by the use there of Yüeh-shan's teaching on non-thinking. For whatever the content of this teaching, in form it is a kōan, a well-known anecdote recorded in the Ch'uan-teng lu and elsewhere and included by Dōgen in his own Shōbōgenzō kōan collection. (DZZ, 2, 225.) Its introduction into the FKZZG may simply represent a stylistic revision -- an attempt to update the manual with material from the fashionable new Ch'an literature; obviously an appreciation for kōan does not itself imply their use in kanna meditation. At the same time, the appearance of such a kōan precisely at the point where the mental practice is presented would certainly seem to raise the question of its practical function there, and it is remarkable that apparently no one has seriously considered the possibility that the passage on non-thinking in the FKZZG is intended, not simply as a description of meditation, but as its object.

To do so might yield a radically new sense to the famous expression with which Dōgen follows this passage: "[*Zazen*] is the practice and verification of ultimate *bodhi*. The *kōan* is realized (*kōan genjō* 公案現成); nets and cages cannot get to it."

NOTES

1. Note that Dōgen's text has reduced the problem of demonic obstructions (*mo-shih*) to a question of mental imbalance: right thought is the antidote for dullness and agitation (*konsan* 昏散).

2. In his use of the term *an-lo* (*sukha*) here Tsung-tse undoubtedly had in mind the "Sukha-vihāra" chapter of the *Saddharma-puṇḍarīka*, from which he quotes later in his work. There it is said that the Bodhisattva's life of ease (*an-lo hsing* 安樂行) consists in always enjoying *tso-ch'an* (*pratisaṃlayana*), retiring from the world to practice the control of his mind. (*T.* 9 [261], 37b10; Tsung-tse's quote is from the verse at 37c16.) In his *Fa-hua wen chü* 法華文句 Chih-i defines *an-lo hsing* as "proceeding in the practice (*hsing*) with body at ease (*an*) and mind joyful (*lo*)." (*T.* 34 [1718], 18a25.) This sense of *an-lo* as the physical and mental pleasure of meditation is well reflected in Dōgen's own *Bendō-wa*: in answer to the question of why among the four attitudes (of walking, standing, sitting, and lying) it is the seated posture that is especially recommended for meditation, Dōgen replies, "The Patriarchs praise it, saying that seated meditation (*zazen*) is the *dharma* gate of ease and joy (*anraku no hōmon* 安樂の法門).

Is this not because among the four attitudes [sitting] is the one of greatest ease and joy?" (DZZ, 1, 737.) The Patriarch referred to here is undoubtedly Tsung-tse himself. Sukha also has, of course, a more exalted sense, as the bliss of Sukhāvati (an-lo kuo 安樂國) or as one of the four attributes of nirvāṇa (ch'ang lo wo ching 常樂我淨); and it is probably by extension from this sense that it is sometimes used in reference to Ch'an enlightenment. So, e.g., in Chang Chün's 張浚 inscription for Ta-hui 大慧 we find, "And hearing these words the Maste: attained the dharma of great peace and joy (ta an-lo fa 大安樂法)." ("Ta-hui P'u-chüeh ch'an-shih t'a-ming" 大慧普覺禪師塔銘, Ta-hui P'u-chüeh ch'an-shih yü-lu 大慧普覺禪師語錄, T. 47 [1989A], 836c23. Note that Dōgen quotes this passage in his SBGZ jishō zanmai 自證三昧, DZZ, 1, 558.)

3. The Bendō-wa passage is not only the first but also the most famous statement of the doctrine:

> The view that practice and enlightenment are not one is heretical. In the Buddha-dharma they are one (shushō kore ittō nari 修證これ一等なり). Inasmuch as practice is based on enlightenment, the practice of a beginner is all of original enlightenment. Therefore, in giving the instruction for practice, a Zen master advises his disciples not to seek enlightenment beyond practice, for practice itself is original enlightenment (jikishi

no honshō 直指の本證). Because it is already enlightenment of practice (shu no shō), there is no end to enlightenment; because it is already practice of enlightenment (shō no shu), there is no beginning to practice. (DZZ, 1, 737; as translated in Hee-Jin Kim, Dōgen Kigen: Mystical Realist [Tucson, Arizona: University of Arizona Press, 1975], p. 79.)

4. See, e.g., Nan-yang ho-shang t'an yü, Hu Shih, Nan-yang ho-shang i-chi, pp. 134, 246-47.

5. The Nan-yüeh story has several variants; Dōgen's version at Sanbyaku soku 2, case 1 (DZZ, 2, 219), appears to come from the Lien-teng hui yao 聯燈會要:

> The [Sixth] Patriarch asked, "Where did you come from?"
> Nan-yüeh answered, "From Sung Shan."
> The Patriarch said, "What is it that comes like this?"
> Nan-yüeh replied, "To say anything would be wrong."
> The Patriarch said, "Then is it contingent on practice and verification?"
> Nan-yüeh said, "Practice and verification are not non-existent; they must not be defiled."
> (ZZ. 2B, 9, 243a.)

This story is one of Dōgen's favorites and appears in many places throughout his writings. It is alluded to in

the opening words of the FKZZG: "Fundamentally speaking, the basis of the way is perfectly pervasive; how could it be contingent on practice and verification?" In the Kōroku text it reappears in the conclusion: "Practice and verification are by nature undefiled; advancement [to enlightenment] is just an everyday affair." Although Dōgen and his school make much of this notion that practice is "undefiled" (fuzenna, akliṣṭa), we ought not forget that -- at least on a literal level -- it is a common tenet of all Buddhist schools that the mārga is by definition free from the defilements (anāsrava). Here, as elsewhere in Zen studies, there is a real need to define more exactly how the school's doctrines are related to the earlier tradition.

6. DZZ, 1, 91-96. The dialogue appears at SBGZ sanbyaku soku 1, case 8 (DZZ, 2, 202), in a version similar to that of the Ching-te ch'uan teng lu:

> During the K'ai-yüan era there was a certain śramaṇa, Tao-i, who lived at the Ch'uan-fa Yüan and practiced tso-ch'an all day. The Master [Huai-jang], knowing that he was a vessel of the dharma, went to him and asked, "Virtuous one, what do you intend by sitting in meditation?"
>
> Tao-i replied, "I intend to make a Buddha."
>
> The Master thereupon took up a tile and began to rub it on a stone in front of Tao-i's hermitage.
>
> Tao-i said, "Master, what are you doing?"

The Master replied, "I'm polishing this to make a mirror."

Tao-i said, "How can you make a mirror by polishing a tile?"

[The Master said,] "How can you make a Buddha by sitting in meditation?"

Tao-i said, "What should I do?"

The Master said, "If a man is driving a cart that won't go, should he whip the cart or whip the horse?"

Tao-i did not respond. The Master went on, "Are you studying seated ch'an (tso-ch'an) or are you studying a seated Buddha (tso-fo 坐佛)? If you're studying seated ch'an, ch'an is not sitting; if you're studying a seated Buddha, Buddhahood is not a fixed form." (T. 51, 240c.)

7. In a similar vein, where Nan-yüeh likens the attempt to become enlightened by sitting in meditation to trying to make a mirror by polishing a tile, Dōgen encourages us to polish the tile; when Nan-yüeh asks if we make a cart go by whipping the cart or whipping the ox, Dōgen tells us to whip the cart.

8. DZZ, 1, 46, 47, 57. Dōgen rejects at the outset of this text any attempt to link his interpretation of gyōbutsu with its more common scholastic sense of "buddha by reason of practice" (as opposed to "buddha in principle" [ributsu 理佛]).

9. It will be noted that this sentence replaces a passage in the Tenpuku text that suggests a more traditional approach to Zen: "[The Patriarchs] devote themselves only to single transmission and direct pointing (tanden jikishi 單傳直指); they engage solely in reversing the body and turning the head (honshin kaitō 翻身廻頭)."

10. DZZ, 1, 540. The Ta-chih-tu lun passage has, in Lamotte's translation:

> C'est pourquoi le Buddha recommande à ses disciples de s'asseoir les jambe repliées (chieh chia-fu tso 結跏趺坐) en tenant le corps droit. Pourquoi? Quand on tient le corps droit, la pensée est facile à diriger. . . . Avec une pensée correcte et un esprit droit, l'ascète fixe son attention. . . . C'est en fixant ainsi son attention que [le Buddha] entra dans le Samādhirājasamādhi. (T. 25, 111b; Le Traité de la Grande Vertu de Sagesse, vol. 1, p. 433.)

From this Dōgen derives the following: "It is clear from this that kekkafu za is the king of samādhis samādhi; it is the verification (shōnyū 證入) itself." (This interpretation, it should be noted, is based on Dōgen's own emendation of the Ta-chih-tu lun text.)

11. The origin of these expressions is unclear. Dōgen regularly attributes them to his master, Ju-ching; and according to Sōtō tradition, it was upon hearing Ju-ching describe Zen as "body and mind sloughed off" that Dōgen was

enlightened. (*Denkō-roku*, *T*. 82, 405a7-13.) The phrase *shinjin datsuraku* does not appear in Ju-ching's *Goroku*; instead we find the somewhat less interesting version, "mental defilements sloughed off" 心塵脱落. (*T*. 48, 130c19. I-yüan's preface to the *Ryakuroku* gives the curious 心塵脱略.) In the *Hōkyō-ki* (and elsewhere) Dōgen quotes Ju-ching on *shinjin datsuraku*: "The study of Zen (*sanzen* 参禅) is body and mind sloughed off. It is only attained when you just sit (*shikan taza*). There is no need to offer incense, make prostrations, recite the name of the Buddha (*nenbutsu* 念仏), practice repentence or read the sūtras." Ju-ching then goes on to say, "Body and mind sloughed off is *zazen*." Interestingly enough, the reason he gives is that "when one just does *zazen* (*shikan zazen*), he is free from the five desires (*goyoku* 五欲, *pañca-kāma*) and removes the five obstructions (*gogai* 五蓋, *pañca-nivaraṇa*)." When Dōgen complains that this explanation is nothing but the sort of thing said by the scholastics (*kyōke* 教家) and reduces *zazen* to the kind of practice common to both Hīnayāna and Mahāyāna, he is rebuked by Ju-ching for criticizing the two vehicles and denying the holy teaching of the Tathāgata. (*DZZ*, 2, 377-78.) Needless to say, this is one of the passages of the *Hōkyō-ki* that has caused problems for those who see Dōgen's Zen as a faithful expression of his master's teachings. In any case, in Dōgen the equation of *shinjin datsuraku* and *shikan taza* tends to become an exact one.

12. On the general question of the importance of the

physical body in Dōgen's practice we should not overlook an interesting passage in the *Zuimon-ki*:

> When one attains the way (*tokudō*), does he attain it with the mind or with the body? Even the scholastics (*kyōke*) say that, since body and mind are one, [the way] is attained with the body. But they say this only because of [their doctrine of] the unity [of body and mind]; they do not explicitly hold that [the way] is attained with the body. Now in our [Zen] school, it is body and mind together that attain [the way]. But of these [two], while one considers and compares (*kekyō suru* 計校する) the *Buddha-dharma* with the mind, he will pass through ten thousand *kalpas* and one thousand rebirths without attaining [the way]. It is when he lets go of the mind (*shin o hōge shite* 心を放下して) and discards his knowledge and understanding (*chiken gee* 知見解會) that he attains [the way]. Those who have clarified the mind through seeing a form (*kenshiki myōshin* 見色明心) or awakened to the way through hearing a sound (*monshō godō* 聞聲悟道) attained [the way] with the body. Therefore, if you completely cast away the thought and the knowledge of the mind (*shin no nenryo chiken* 心の念慮知見) and just sit (*shikan taza*), you become somewhat more intimate with the way. Therefore, it

is precisely with the body that one attains the way; and it is because of this that I believe you should concentrate solely on sitting. (DZZ, 2, 458.)

The doubt expressed here regarding the value of thinking about the dharma is, of course, a familiar Ch'an theme; the explicit celebration of the body is rather less common. The Zuimon-ki does not present a picture of Dōgen at his philosophical best, and in his more doctrinally guarded moments he would never set up the logical alternatives of body and mind that he assumes here. This makes the passage -- if indeed it is an accurate report of his teaching -- all the more interesting. One cannot help but be reminded here of those meditation specialists of the early Buddhist tradition known as kāya-sakṣin (shen-cheng 身證), or "bodily witnesses."

13. DZZ, 2, 88. On the basis of this passage Menzan, in his FKZZG monge, informs us that thinking about thinking is ushin and is not proper zazen; not thinking about thinking is mushin and is also not proper zazen; but thinking about not-thinking is true wisdom. (SSZ, Chūkai 3, 19.) Most of the commentaries on this passage in the FKZZG are of much the same sort.

14. See, e.g., Akishige, "FKZZG kō," p. 480. The statement that zazen is not shūzen derives from an interesting passage on Bodhidharma in the Lin-chien lu 林間錄 by Chüeh-fan Hui-hung 覺範慧洪 (1071-1128):

When Bodhidharma first went to Wei from Liang, he proceeded to the foot of Sung Shan, where he stopped at Shao-lin. There he just sat facing a wall (mien-pi yen-tso erh i 面壁燕坐而已). This was not the practice of dhyāna (hsi-ch'an 習禪), but after a while others, unable to fathom what he was doing, held that Dharma practiced dhyāna. This dhyāna (ch'an-na禪那) is but one among various practices; how could it suffice to exhaust [the practice of] the sage (sheng-jen 聖人)? Nevertheless, people of that time understood [Dharma's practice] in this way; the historians followed this [understanding] and recorded him with those who practiced dhyāna, thus making him a confederate of the partisans of "dead trees and cold ashes" (k'u-mu ssu-hui 枯木死灰). Be that as it may, [the practice of] the sage does not stop at dhyāna; and yet it does not differ from it. It is like change (i易), which is beyond yin陰 and yang陽 and yet does not differ from them. (ZZ. 2B, 21, 295d.)

The reference to "the historians" here is to Tao-hsüan 道宣 (596-667), whose Hsü kao-seng chuan 續高僧傳 includes Bodhidharma's biography in the section on dhyāna practitioners ("Hsi-ch'an"; T. 50 [2060], 551b). Dōgen quotes Hui-hung's passage in full in several places, generally in the context of arguments against the notion that Bodhidharma was

the founder of a separate Ch'an school. (See SBGZ butsudō, DZZ, 1, 137; SBGZ gyōji, ibid., 142; EHKR, ibid., 2, 129.)

15. See, e.g., Yü-ch'ieh-shih ti lun 瑜伽師地論 (Yogācāra-bhūmi-śāstra), T. 30 (1579), 651b22-3.

16. Wen-shu-shih-li so shuo pu-ssu-i fo ching-chieh ching 文殊師利所說不思議佛境界經, T. 12 (340), 108a-b.

17. See, e.g., Nan-yang ho-shang t'an yü, Hu Shih, Nan-yang ho-shang i-chi, p. 235. For an example of the use of fei-ssu-liang in early Ch'an, see the Hsin hsin ming, T. 51, 457b17.

18. Ta pao chi ching 大寶積經, T. 11 (310), 566b20.

19. Shen-hui yü-lu, Hu Shih, Shen-hui ho-shang i-chi, p. 129; Liu-tsu t'an ching, Philip Yampolsky, The Platform Sutra of the Sixth Patriarch (New York: Columbia University, 1967), p. 7. It will be noted that the equivocation on the term nien which makes these definitions possible is exactly mirrored in Yüeh-shan's identification of fei-ssu-liang with "thinking of not-thinking."

20. So, e.g., Suzuki Daisetsu:

> In works like Shōbōgenzō zazenshin we see a contemplation of the Silent Illumination type (mokushō no kan 黙照の観), and the dynamic aspect of the reciprocal interrelation between one thing and another, the aspect of discrimination in non-discrimination (fushiryō no shiryō), rather tends to be obscured. . . .

> The odour of Silent Illumination that accompanies Dōgen's kind of sitting is not easily removed . . . . In Dōgen's Zen a faint shadow of inactivity and stagnation is visible. (Zen shisō shi kenkyū 禅思想史研究, vol. 1 [Tokyo: Iwanami Shoten, 1943], pp. 67, 78; translated by Norman Waddell in "Dōgen, Hakuin, Bankei: Three Types of Thought in Japanese Zen," The Eastern Buddhist, new series, 9, 1 [5/1976]. pp. 13, 17.)

21. This sentiment is repeated frequently; see, e.g., Zanmai ō zanmai: "In the last four or five hundred years it is only my former master [Ju-ching] who has clearly gouged out the eye of the Buddhas and Patriarchs and sat within the eye of the Buddhas and Patriarchs. Few there are in China to compare with him." (DZZ, 1, 539.) On the orthodoxy of the Ts'ao-tung lineage, see Jishō zanmai:

> You should know that it is the tradition of Ch'ing-yüan Shan 青原山 which represents the correct transmission of the certificate of lineage (shisho 嗣書) of the Buddhas and Patriarchs of the Western region and the Eastern land. After Ch'ing-yüan it was correctly transmitted by Tung-shan himself. This is something completely unknown anywhere else; the only ones who know it are the descendents of Tung-shan, who spread his fame in the monastic community (unsui ni seimei o hodokosu 雲水に聲名をほどこす)."

(DZZ, 1, 559.)

In its emphases on a single orthodox transmission (tanden 單傳) unknown to the larger Buddhist community and on the material evidence of that transmission there is much in this passage to remind one again of the spirit of Shen-hui. Apparently Buddhists in both China and Japan set great store by certificates of lineage (shisho) during this period; indeed, Dōgen's predecessor Nōnin, who himself never went to China, was obliged to dispatch his disciples to the mainland solely for the purpose of obtaining such a document. The Hōkyō-ki records Dōgen's appreciation of these certificates while he was in China, and he devoted one of the texts of the SBGZ to the subject (SBGZ shisho 嗣書, DZZ, 1, 337-47). For his own shisho from Ju-ching, see DZZ, 2, 287.

Several theories have recently been put forward to explain Dōgen's rather sudden and vitriolic attack on the Lin-chi school: (1) that it is a reflection of important developments in Dōgen's own understanding of Zen (Masutani Fumio 增谷文雄, Rinzai to Dōgen 臨済と道元 [Tokyo: Shunjūsha, 1971]); (2) that it is a reaction to the growing success of Dōgen's Rinzai competitors in Japan, especially the popular Enni 圓爾 (1202-80) (Furuta Shōkin, Nihon bukkyō-shi no sho-mondai); (3) that it represents an attempt by Dōgen to woo his new converts from the Nihon Daruma school away from their Rinzai background (Imaeda Aishin, Chūsei zenshū shi no kenkyū); (4) that it is a product of Dōgen's

disappointment over the failure of Ju-ching's Lin-chi-oriented Chinese disciples to appreciate the uniqueness of his message (Yanagida Seizan, "Dōgen to Rinzai").

22. *DZZ*, 1, 556-59. Dōgen extends his criticism here to Ta-hui's descendants (*monka* 門下), and elsewhere he criticizes Ta-hui's disciple Fo-chao Te-kuang 佛照德光 (1121-1203). At the same time, it should be noted that he has high praise for Ta-hui's teacher, Yüan-wu K'o-ch'in. For other critical comments on Ta-hui, see *Ōsaku sendaba* 王索仙陀婆, *DZZ*, 1, 595; *Jinshin inga* 深信因果, *DZZ*, 1, 680.

23. Dōgen rebukes Ta-hui, not for his use of *kung-an*, but for his failure to understand them. In his *Jishō zanmai*, after criticizing Ta-hui's notion of "self verification and self awakening" (*jishō jigo* 自證自悟), Dōgen closes with the remark, "During his lifetime the Ch'an master Tsung-kao never understood the expression 'self verification and self awakening,' much less did he penetrate any other *kōan*." (*DZZ*, 1, 559.)

24. Note especially the *Kōroku* text's omission of the earlier passages on maintaining *samādhi*-*bala*, on the "one teaching of *dhyāna*" (*zenjō ichimon* 禪定一門), and on the "condition of *dhyāna*" (*jōen* 定縁) and "power of *samādhi*" (*jōriki* 定力) as the bases of enlightenment. Unfortunately, these omissions leave the pronoun *shi*, in the expression *ichi nin shi riki* 一任此力, without any intelligible antecedent.

25. While *wang-yüan* 忘縁 originally had a positive

connotation (as, e.g., at Hsin-hsin ming, T. 51, 457b12), by Dōgen's time -- like the closely similar wang-chi忘機 and wang-ch'ing忘情 -- it was also used in a perjorative sense to describe a meditative calm devoid of wisdom. So, e.g., Wu-men says, "To indulge yourself and forget objects (wang-yüan) is to fall into a deep pit." ("Ch'an chen"禪箴, Wu-men kuan無門關, T. 48 [2005], 299b1. It is interesting to note that in this text Wu-men also criticizes the practices of "being aware of thoughts as soon as they arise" [nien ch'i chi chüeh念起卽覺] and "sitting solidly practicing samādhi" [wu-jen hsi ting兀然習定]. Dōgen, it should be remembered, did not see Wu-men's work.)

26. For Ta-hui's criticisms of mo-chao ch'an, see Ta-hui shu大慧書, Ta-hui P'u-chüeh ch'an-shih yü-lu, T. 47, 918a, 923a, 925a, 941b. Ta-hui likes to refer to this kind of meditation as "the demon cave of the Black Mountain."

27. When Dōgen arrived in China he first went to study on T'ien-t'ung Shan with Wu-chi Liao-p'ai無際了派 (1149-1224); he later traveled to Ching Shan徑山 to study with Che-weng Ju-yen浙翁如琰(1151-1225). Both these men were disciples of Fo-chao Te-kuang, who had studied with Ta-hui (and who had given his certificate of transmission to Dainichi-bō Nōnin). Dōgen also received the teachings of P'an-shan Ssu-cho盤山思卓 (d.u.), another of Ta-hui's descendents. A review of Dōgen's activities in China can be found in Kodera, "Dōgen's Formative Years in China," pp. 60-134.

28. The truth of this tradition, known from the

Kenzei-ki, is still being argued. It has been defended by Takeuchi Michio in his "Eihei Dōgen to Hekigan-roku 永平道元と碧巖録," SK, 1 (3/1956), pp. 110-31; and more recently in his "Futatabi Dōgen zenji no Ichiya Hekigan shōrai ni tsuite" 再び道元禅師の一夜碧巖将来について, SK, 19 (3/1977), pp. 22-27.

APPENDIX A

The Major Redactions of the Kana SBGZ

The so-called kana 假字, or Japanese, SBGZ is surely Dōgen's most famous and most studied work. Strictly speaking, however, it is not a single work but a collection -- or rather several collections -- of independent texts, composed during a period of some two decades and compiled over the space of more than half a millennium. The textual history of the FKZZG is extremely complex; while much work has been done on the subject, much more remains to be done. There is no need here to enter into details; but in order to understand the references to the MSS and editions of the SBGZ occurring in our discussion of the dating of the Kōroku FKZZG, it is necessary to have some familiarity with the various redactions of the book.

Although very few of the texts of the SBGZ seem to have been transmitted separately, it is by no means clear how many of them were originally intended for inclusion in this collection -- or, indeed, whether Dōgen himself saw these texts as a part of a single SBGZ. There is evidence that he once invisioned such a collection, to be comprised of 100 fascicles; but the same evidence indicates that he began work on this project toward the very end of his life, and

that it was never brought to fulfillment. (See Ejō's postface to the SBGZ hachi dainin gaku 八大人覺, DZZ, 1, 726.) Hence, it is quite possible that most of the texts were composed before Dōgen planned a SBGZ, and it has been suggested that he himself may never have used this title for these texts. (See Furuta, SBGZ no kenkyū, pp. 17-24.)

The popular version of the SBGZ in use today is a collection of 95 texts, arranged in chronological order of composition; often referred to as the Honzan 本山 edition, it was originally published by Eihei-ji in 1811. (This is the version appearing at T. 82 [2582], pp. 7-209; for many years it has been read in the edition by Etō Sokuō, SBGZ, 3 vols., Iwanami bunko, 1989-92 [Tokyo: Iwanami Shoten, 1939-43].) The Honzan edition is largely based on an earlier 95-kan edition from the Genroku 元祿 era (1688-1704) by Kōzen 晃全 (1627-93), thirty-fifth abbot of Eihei-ji. Prior to the Edo period, the SBGZ circulated in several different redactions. One, in 83 kan, is preserved in the Rurikō-ji 瑠璃光寺 MS of 1490-91; more popular appears to have been an 84-kan version, dating back to an edition of 1419, by a monk named Bonsei 梵清 (d. 1427). (Only a fragment of Bonsei's own MS is extant, but the content of the collection is known from two Edo copies, the Chōen-ji 長圓寺 and Gyokuun-ji 玉雲寺 texts.) Both these fifteenth century editions combine the texts of two earlier redactions in 75 and 60 fascicles. The 75-kan SBGZ (extant in the Kenkon-in 乾坤院 and Shōbō-ji 正法寺 MSS from the fourteenth and fifteenth

centuries respectively) is widely held to represent the earliest form of the SBGZ, put together either by Dōgen himself or by Ejō in the years following Dōgen's death; the 60-kan version (extant in the Dōun-ji 洞雲寺 MS from 1510) is thought to have been made in the fourteenth century by the fifth abbot of Eihei-ji, Giun. (The SBGZ collection in DZZ, 1, follows the 75-kan redaction, supplemented by other early traditions; the texts themselves, however, are most often based on the 60-kan Dōun-ji MSS.)

The exact relationship between the 60- and 75-kan redactions, and the question of which represents the more "authentic" SBGZ, is still the subject of considerable dispute. The reasons for preferring the 75-kan version have been summarized by Mizuno Yaoko in "SBGZ no sho-hon sono ta ni tsuite" 正法眼蔵の諸本その他について, in Nishio Minoru 西尾実, et al., ed., SBGZ, SBGZ zuimon-ki, Nihon koten bungaku taikei 日本古典文学大系, 81 (Tokyo: Iwanami Shoten, 1965), pp. 36-38. She has given additional argument in "Kohon SBGZ no naiyō to sono sōgō kankei" 古本正法眼蔵の内容とその相互関係, SK, 15 (3/1973), pp. 68-73; and in "Nanajūgo-kan SBGZ seiritsu no jiki" 七十五巻正法眼蔵成立の時期, SK, 18 (3/1976), pp. 33-40. The arguments in favor of the 60-kan version have been summarized (but not defended) in Nagahisa Gakusui, "Nanajūgo-kan SBGZ to rokujū-kan SBGZ" 七十五巻正法眼蔵と六十巻正法眼蔵, SK, 9 (3/1967), pp. 6-7. In a provocative article Yanagida Seizan has recently

suggested that it was in fact the 60-kan version that Ejō worked on with Dōgen, and that the 75-kan version was a collection made by Senne; see "Kanna SBGZ no himitsu" 仮字正法眼蔵の秘密, Tenbō 展望, 210 (6/1976), pp. 49-50.

Finally, we may mention two other early collections: the so-called shinsō 新草 SBGZ in twelve fascicles, edited by Dōgen himself and intended to form part of his proposed 100-kan SBGZ (extant in a 1446 MS at Eihei-ji and published in DZZ, 1, 603-726; this collection has recently been translated in Yūhō Yokoi and Daisen Victoria, Zen Master Dōgen [New York and Tokyo: Weatherhill, 1976], pp. 67-177); and a 28-kan version, known as the himitsu 秘密, or secret, SBGZ (extant in an undated MS at Eihei-ji), which for the most part appears to collect texts excluded from the 60-kan redaction because of their criticisms of certain famous Lin-chi masters.

The most comprehensive single study of the textual history of the SBGZ is undoubtedly Nagahisa Gakusui's SBGZ chojutsu-shi no kenkyū 正法眼蔵著述史の研究 (Tokyo: Nakayama Shobō, 1972). For a brief summary of the major texts, see Mizuno's article, cited above, in the Nihon koten bungaku taikei. A convenient (though slightly flawed) comparative table of the major textual traditions appears in Zengaku dai jiten 禅学大辞典, s.v. "Shōbōgenzō." The early MSS of the SBGZ are now being published under the title Eihei SBGZ shūsho taisei 永平正法眼蔵蒐書大成, Eihei SBGZ Shūsho Taisei Kankōkai, comp. (Tokyo: Taishūkan,

1974-). The first volume of a complete -- but so far rather disappointing -- English translation of the SBGZ has appeared from Kōsen Nishiyama and John Stevens: Shōbōgenzō: The Eye and Treasury of the True Law, vol. 1 (Sendai, Japan: Daihokkaikaku, 1975).

APPENDIX B

Comparative Table of Texts

This table is based on the texts published in the following sources:

> Ch'an-yüan ch'ing-kuei Tso-ch'an i, Kagamishima, Zen'en Shingi, pp. 279-83
>
> Tenpuku FKZZG, DZZ, 2, 3-5
>
> Kōroku FKZZG, DZZ, 2, 165-66
>
> Bendō-hō "zazen-hō," DZZ, 2, 318
>
> SBGZ zazen-gi, DZZ, 1, 88-89

A table comparing the central section of the Kōroku FKZZG with the Tso-ch'an i, the T'ien-t'ai hsiao chih-kuan, and other meditation manuals may be found in Sekiguchi Shindai, Tendai shikan no kenkyū, pp. 328-35.

Tenpuku FKZZG

原夫道本圓通爭假
修證宗乘自在何費
功夫況乎全體迥出
塵埃孰信拂拭之

CYCK Tso-ch'an i

夫學般若菩薩先當
起大悲心發弘誓願
精修三昧誓度衆生
不為一身獨求解脫

Bendō-hō

Kōroku FKZZG

原夫道本圓通爭假
修證宗乘自在何費
功夫況乎全體迥出
塵垓今孰信拂拭之

SBGZ zazen-gi

Tenpuku FKZZG

手段大都不離當處
豈用修行之脚頭然
而毫釐有差天地懸
隔違順纔起紛然失
心須知歷劫輪迴還
因擬議之一念塵世
迷道復由商量之無
休欲起向上之徹底

CYCK Tso-ch'an i

Bendō-hō

Kōroku FKZZG

手段大都不離當處
今豈用修行之脚頭
者乎然而毫釐有差
天地懸隔違順纔起
紛然失心

SBGZ zazen-gi

Tenpuku FKZZG

唯解直下之承當直
鐃誇會豈悟獲瞥地
之智通得道明心學
衝天之志氣雖有入
頭之量尚欠出身之
路矧彼釋迦老子之
為生知已在六年端
坐之跡

CYCK Tso-ch'an i

Bendō-hō

Kōroku FKZZG

直
鐃誇會豈悟今獲瞥
地之智通得道明心
今學衝天之志氣雖
逍遙於入頭之邊量
幾虧闕於出身之活
路矧彼祇薗之為生
知今端坐六年之蹤

SBGZ zazen-gi

Tenpuku FKZZG

達磨大師之
傳心印更貽九歲面
壁之蹤古聖既然今
人盍辦所以翻尋言
逐語之解行須迴光
返照之退步自然身
心脱落本來面目現
前欲得恁麼

CYCK Tso-ch'an i

Bendō-hō

Kōroku FKZZG

跡可見少林之傳心
印兮面壁九歲之聲
名尚聞古聖既然今
人盍辦所以須休尋
言逐語之解行須學
回光返照之退步身
心自然脱落本來面
目現前欲得恁麼事

SBGZ zazen-gi

Tenpuku FKZZG

急務坐禪
夫參禪者靜室宜焉
飲飡節矣
|

CYCK Tso-ch'an i

Bendō-hō

Kōroku FKZZG

急務恁麼事
夫參禪者靜室宜焉
飲飡節矣

SBGZ zazen-gi

參禪は坐禪なり坐禪は靜處よろし坐蓐あ
つくしくべし風烟をいらしむることなか
れ雨露をもらしむることなかれ容身の地
を護持すべしかつて金剛のうへに坐し盤
石のうへに坐する蹤跡ありかれらみな草
をあつくしきて坐せしなり坐處あきらか

Tenpuku FKZZG

乃放捨諸縁休息萬事

不思善悪莫管是非停心意識之運轉止念想觀之測量

CYCK Tso-ch'an i

爾乃放捨諸縁休息萬事身心一如動靜無間量其飲食不多不少調其睡眠不節不恣

Bendō-hō

Kōroku FKZZG

放捨諸縁休息萬事

不思善悪莫管是非停心意識之運轉止念想觀之測量莫圖作佛豈拘坐臥

SBGZ zazen-gi

なるべし晝夜くらからざれ冬暖夏涼をその術とせり諸縁を放捨し萬事を休息すべし善也不思量なり悪也不思量なり心意識にあらず念想觀にあらず作佛を圖することなかれ坐臥を脱落すべし飲食を節量すべし光陰を護惜すべし頭燃をはらふが

Tenpuku FKZZG

正坐之時
厚敷坐物上用蒲
團

CYCK Tso-ch'an i

欲坐禪時於閑靜
處厚敷坐物

Bendō-hō

正坐禪時
必用蒲
團

Kōroku FKZZG

乎　尋常坐
處厚敷坐物上用蒲
團

SBGZ zazen-gi

ごとく坐禪をこのむべし黄梅山の五祖こ
となるいとなみなし惟務坐禪のみなり坐
禪のとき袈裟をかくべし蒲團をしくべし
蒲團は全跏にしくにはあらず跏趺の半よ
りはうしろにしくなりしかれば累足のし
たは坐蓐にあたれり背骨のしたは蒲團に

Tenpuku FKZZG

然後結跏趺坐或
半跏趺坐謂結跏趺
坐先以右上安左䏶
上左足安右䏶上

CYCK Tso-ch'an i

寛繋衣帶令威儀齊
整然後結跏趺坐
先以右足安左䏶
上左足安右䏶上

Bendō-hō

或結跏趺坐
謂結跏趺
坐先以右足安左䏶
上次以左足安右䏶
上

Kōroku FKZZG

或結跏趺坐或
半跏趺坐謂結跏趺
坐先以右足安左䏶
上左足安右䏶上

SBGZ zazen-gi

てあるなり　これ佛佛祖祖の坐禪のとき坐
する法なり　あるいは半跏趺坐し　あるいは
結跏趺坐す　結跏趺坐はみぎのあしをひだ
りのももの上におくひだりの足をみぎの
もものうへにおくあしのさきおのおのも
もとひとしくすべし　參差なることえざれ

Tenpuku FKZZG

半跏趺坐但以左足
壓右胜矣寛繫衣帯
可令齊整次右手安
左足上左掌安右掌
上以兩大拇指面相
拄

CYCK Tso-ch'an i

或半跏趺坐亦可但
以左足壓右足而已
次以右手
安左足上左掌安右
掌上以兩手大拇指
面相拄

Bendō-hō

或者半跏趺坐亦可
但以左足壓右足而
已 次以右手
安左足上左掌安右
掌上兩手大拇指面
相拄

Kōroku FKZZG

半跏趺坐但以左足
壓右胜矣寛繫衣帯
可令齊整次右手安
左足上左掌安右掌
上兩大拇指面相拄
矣

SBGZ zazen-gi

半跏趺坐はただ左の足を右のもものうへ
におくのみなり衣衫を寛繫して齊整なら
しむべし右手を左足のうへにおく左手を
右手のうへにおくふたつのおほゆびさき
あひささふ兩手かくのごとくして身にち
かづけておくなりふたつのおほゆびのさ

Tenpuku FKZZG

乃正身端坐
不得左側右
傾前躬後仰

CYCK Tso-ch'an i

徐徐擧身前欠復左
右搖振乃正身端坐
不得左傾右
側前躬後仰令腰背
頭項骨節相拄狀如
浮屠又不得聳身太
過令人氣急不安

Bendō-hō

直須正身端
坐謂頂𩕳脊骨相拄
而端直不得左側右
傾前躬後仰

Kōroku FKZZG

乃正身端坐
不得左躬右
傾前躬後仰

SBGZ zazen-gi

しあはせたるさきをほそに對しておくべし正身端坐すべしひだりへそばたちみぎへかたぶきまへにくぐまりうしろへあふぐことなかれ

Tenpuku FKZZG

要令耳與肩對鼻與
臍對舌掛上腭唇齒
相著目須常開

CYCK Tso-ch'an i

要令耳與肩對鼻與
臍對舌拄上腭唇齒
相著目須微開
免致昏睡若得
禪定其力最勝古有
習定高僧坐常開目
向法雲圓通禪師亦
訶人閉目坐禪以謂

Bendō-hō

要令耳與肩對鼻與
臍對舌掛上腭唇齒
相著目須正開不張
不微

Kōroku FKZZG

要令耳與肩對鼻與
臍對舌掛上腭唇齒
相著目須常開

SBGZ zazen-gi

かならず耳と肩と對し鼻と臍と對すべし
舌はかならず腭にかくべし息は鼻より通
ずべしくちびる齒あひつくべし目は開す
べし不張不微なるべし

Tenpuku FKZZG

身相
旣定氣息亦調

CYCK Tso-ch'an i

黑山鬼窟蓋有深旨
達者知焉
身相
旣定氣息旣調
然後寬放臍腹
一切善

Bendō-hō

莫以瞼掩
瞳莫以項差背鼻息
任通不喘不聲不長
不短不緩不急身心
俱調 擧體
數欠內外放寬左右
搖振七八箇

Kōroku FKZZG

鼻息
徹通
身相
旣調 欠氣
一息 左右
搖振

SBGZ zazen-gi

かくのごとく身心をととのへて欠氣一息あるべし

Tenpuku FKZZG

念起卽
覺覺之卽失久久忘
緣自成一片
此坐禪之要
術也謂坐禪
則大安樂法

CYCK Tso-ch'an i

惡都莫思量念起卽
覺覺之卽失久久忘
緣自成一片
此坐禪之要
術也竊謂坐禪
乃安樂法門

Bendō-hō

兀兀坐
定思量箇不思量底
不思量底如何思量
非思量矣乃坐禪之
要術也

Kōroku FKZZG

兀兀坐
定思量箇不思量底
不思量底如何思量
非思量此乃坐禪之
要術也所謂坐禪非
習禪也唯是安樂之

SBGZ zazen-gi

兀兀と坐定して思量箇不思量底なり不思量如何思量これ非思量なりこれすなはち坐禪の法術なり坐禪は習禪にはあらず大安樂の法門なり

Tenpuku FKZZG

門也

若得此意自然四大
輕安精神爽利正念
分明法味資神寂然
清樂日用天眞也

CYCK Tso-ch'an i

而人多致疾
者蓋不善用心故也
若善得此意則自然
四大輕安精神爽利
正念分明法味資神
寂然清樂

Bendō-hō

Kōroku FKZZG

法門也究盡菩提之
修證也公案現成羅
籠未到

若得此意

SBGZ zazen-gi

不染汚の修證なり

Tenpuku FKZZG

已能發明可謂如
龍得水似虎靠山
當知正念現前
皆散

CYCK Tso-ch'an i

若已有發明者可謂
如龍得水似虎靠山
若未有發明者亦乃
因風吹火用力不多
但辨肯心必不相賺
然而道高魔盛逆順
萬端但能正念現前
一切不能留礙

Bendō-hō

Kōroku FKZZG

如龍得水似虎靠山
當知正念現前
皆散

SBGZ zazen-gi

Tenpuku FKZZG

易到
若從坐起徐
徐動身安祥而起不
慮卒暴於一
切時中護

CYCK Tso-ch'an i

如楞嚴經天台止觀
圭峰修證儀具明魔
事預備不虞者不可
不知也若欲出定徐
徐動身安詳而起不
得卒暴出定之後一
切時中常作方便護

Bendō-hō

徐而起
若欲起坐徐

Kōroku FKZZG

先撲落
若從坐起徐
徐動身安祥而起不
慮卒暴

SBGZ zazen-gi

Tenpuku FKZZG
持定力
參究之
超上關無本可據證
祇之被自礙所以未
留乃道之十成也誠
禪定一門
最為高勝

CYCK Tso-ch'an i
持定力如護嬰兒郎
定力易成矣
夫
禪定一門最為急務
若不安禪
靜慮到這裏總須茫

Bendō-hō

Kōroku FKZZG

SBGZ zazen-gi

Tenpuku FKZZG

先以十分之會學次

CYCK Tso-ch'an i

然所以探珠宜靜浪
動水取應難定水澄
清心珠自現故圓覺
經云無礙清淨慧皆
依禪定生法華經云
在於閑處修攝其心
安住不動如須彌山

Bendō-hō

Kōroku FKZZG

SBGZ zazen-gi

Tenpuku FKZZG

轉一半之證來只在
此法拈花破顏禮拜
得髓皆承他之恩力
而獲大自在者也學
般若菩薩詎不隨順
者乎掌觀超凡越聖
必假靜緣坐脫立亡
能任定力況復拈竿

CYCK Tso-ch'an i

是知超凡越聖
必假靜緣坐脫立亡
須憑定力

Bendō-hō

Kōroku FKZZG

掌觀超凡越聖
坐脫立亡
一任此力矣況復拈

SBGZ zazen-gi

Tenpuku FKZZG

針鎚之轉機拂拳棒
喝之證契未是思量
分別之所能解也豈
爲神通修證之所能
知也　可爲聲
色之外威儀那非知
見前軌則者歟然則
不論上智下愚莫簡

CYCK Tso-ch'an i

Bendō-hō

Kōroku FKZZG

指竿針鎚之轉機擧
拂拳棒喝之證契未
是思量分別之所能
解也豈爲神通修證
之所能知也可爲聲
色之外威儀那非知
見前軌則者歟然則
不論上智下愚莫簡

SBGZ zazen-gi

Tenpuku FKZZG

利人鈍者放解六根
見轉全道不生一念
坐斷十方

凡夫自界他方佛法
本無異法西天東地
祖門遂開五門等持

CYCK Tso-ch'an i

Bendō-hō

Kōroku FKZZG

利人鈍者

專一功夫
正是辨道修證自不
染汚趣向更是平常
也凡夫自界他方
西天東地
等持

SBGZ zazen-gi

Tenpuku FKZZG

佛印各擅宗風唯務
單傳直指尋事翻身
迴頭
雖謂千差萬別但喜
歸程祥參

CYCK Tso-ch'an i

一生取辦尚恐
蹉跎況乃遷延將何
敵業故古人云若無

Bendō-hō

Kōroku FKZZG

佛印一擅宗風唯務
打坐被礙兀地
雖謂萬別千差
祗管參禪
辦道

SBGZ zazen-gi

Tenpuku FKZZG

何忘
却自家之坐牀謾去
來他國之塵境若錯
一歩當面蹉過既得
人身之應會莫虚度
光陰必憶佛道之當
行誰浪樂石火加以

CYCK Tso-ch'an i

定力甘伏死門掩目
空歸宛然流浪

Bendō-hō

Kōroku FKZZG

何抛
卻自家之坐牀謾去
來他國之塵境若錯
一歩當面蹉過既得
人身之機要莫虚度
光陰保任佛道之要
機誰浪樂石火加以

SBGZ zazen-gi

Tenpuku FKZZG

形質如草露運命似
電光倏忽便空須臾
卽失
冀其參學高流
久習摸象勿怪眞龍
早向直指端的之正
道速成絕學無爲之

CYCK Tso-ch'an i

幸諸禪友三復
斯文自利利他同成
正覺

Bendō-hō

Kōroku FKZZG

形質如草露運命似
電光倏忽便至須臾
既失
冀其參學高流
久習摸象勿怪眞龍
精進直指端的之道
尊貴絕學無爲之人

SBGZ zazen-gi

Tenpuku FKZZG

眞人方遵百丈之規
繼遍通少林之消息

莫勞
拂耳之風更驚擊舌
之響耶

但能正開自
寶藏受用便如意

CYCK Tso-ch'an i

Bendō-hō

Kōroku FKZZG

合沓佛佛之菩提嫡
嗣祖祖之三昧

久爲恁麼須
是恁麼寶藏自開受
用如意

SBGZ zazen-gi

APPENDIX C

Comparative Table of Texts in Translation

This table compares the Tenpuku version of the FKZZG (FKZZG [A]) with the following:

CYCK: Ch'an-yüan ch'ing-kuei Tso ch'an i

FKZZG (B): Kōroku FKZZG

SBGZ: SBGZ zazen-gi

BDH: Bendō-hō "zazen-hō"

For convenience of comparison the following conventions have been used:

CAPITALS: (a) in CYCK, passages common to FKZZG (A)

(b) in other texts, passages common to CYCK

Underlining: (a) in FKZZG, passages not common to (A) and (B)

(b) in other texts, passages not common to FKZZG

The Kōroku version of the FKZZG has been translated into English several times; probably the most careful is that of Normal Waddell and Abe Masao: "Dōgen's Fukanzazengi and Shōbōgenzō zazengi," The Eastern Buddhist, new series, 6, 2 (10/1973), pp. 115-28. As its title indicates, this article includes a translation of the Japanese Zazen-gi; it also provides a translation of the "FKZZG senjutsu yurai."

My own translations occasionally owe a debt to this work. The Tenpuku text of the FKZZG has been translated into German by Heinrich Dumoulin: "Allgemeine Lehren zur Förderung des Zazen von Zen-Meister Dōgen," Monumenta Nipponica, 14 (1958), pp. 429-36. The Bendō-hō has been translated in Rōshi Jiyu Kennett, Zen is Eternal Life (Emeryville, Calif.: Dharma Publishing, 1976), pp. 112-23.

CYCK

THE BODHISATTVA WHO STUDIES PRAJÑĀ should first arouse the thought of great compassion, make the great vows, and exactly cultivate samādhi. Vowing to save sentient beings, he should not seek liberation for himself alone.

FKZZG (A)

Fundamentally speaking, the basis of the way is perfectly pervasive; how could it be contingent on practice and verification? The vehicle of the ancestors is naturally unrestricted; why should we expend sustained effort? Surely the whole being is far beyond defilement; who could believe in a method to polish it? Never is it apart from this very place; what is the use of a pilgrimage to practice it? And yet, if a hair's breadth of distinction exists, the gap is like that between heaven and earth; once the slightest like or dislike arises, all is confused and the mind is lost. <u>You should know that repeated migrations through eons of time depend on a single moment's reflection; losing the way in this world of defilement derives from the failure to stop deliberation. If you wish to transcend to the extreme beyond, just directly accede [to the way]</u>.

FKZZG (B)

Fundamentally speaking, the basis of the way is perfectly pervasive; how could it be contingent on practice and verification? The vehicle of the ancestors is naturally unrestricted; why should we expend sustained effort? Surely the whole being is far beyond defilement; who could believe in a method to polish it? Never is it apart from this very place; what is the use of a pilgrimage to practice it? And yet, if a hair's breadth of distinction exists, the gap is like that between heaven and earth; once the slightest like or dislike arises, all is confused and the mind is lost.

FKZZG (A)

Though you are proud of your understanding and replete with insight, get hold of the wisdom that knows at a glance; though you attain the way and clarify the mind, give rise to the spirit that assaults the heavens: for one may have gained the precincts of the entrance and still be missing the path of liberation. Even in the case of that old one, Śākyamuni, innately wise though he was, there remains the mark of his six years sitting erect; even the great master Bodhidharma, though he succeeded to the mind seal, left the trace of his nine years facing the wall. When even the ancient sages were like this, how could men today dispense with pursuing [the way]? Therefore, reverse the intellectual practice of investigating words and chasing after talk; take the backward step of turning the light and shining it back. Of themselves body and mind will drop away, and your original face will appear. If you want such [a state], urgently work at zazen.

FKZZG (B)

Though you are proud of your understanding and replete with insight, get hold of the wisdom that knows at a glance; though you attain the way and clarify the mind, give rise to the spirit that assaults the heavens: for one may loiter in the precincts of the entrance and still lack something of the vital path of liberation. Even in the case of the one of Jetavana, innately wise though he was, we can see the traces of his six years sitting erect; and in the case of the one of Shao-lin, though he succeeded to the mind seal, we still hear of the fame of his nine years facing the wall. When even the ancient sages were like this, how could men today dispense with pursuing [the way]? Therefore, stop the intellectual practice of investigating words and chasing after talk; study the backward step of turning the light and shining it back. Body and mind will drop away of themselves, and your original face will appear. If you want such a state, urgently work at such a state.

CYCK

THEN CAST ASIDE ALL INVOLVEMENTS AND DISCONTINUE ALL AFFAIRS. Make body and mind one, with no division between action and rest. REGULATE FOOD AND DRINK, so that you take neither too much nor too little; adjust sleep, so that you neither deprive nor indulge yourself.

FKZZG (A)

For studying Zen ONE SHOULD HAVE QUIET QUARTERS. BE MODERATE IN FOOD AND DRINK. THEN CAST ASIDE ALL INVOLVEMENTS AND DISCONTINUE ALL AFFAIRS. DO NOT THINK OF GOOD OR EVIL; do not deal with right or wrong. Halt the revolutions of mind, intellect, and consciousness; stop the calculations of thoughts, ideas, and perceptions.

FKZZG (B)

For studying Zen ONE SHOULD HAVE QUIET QUARTERS. BE MODERATE IN FOOD AND DRINK. CAST ASIDE ALL INVOLVEMENTS AND DISCONTINUE ALL AFFAIRS. DO NOT THINK OF GOOD OR EVIL; do not deal with right or wrong. Halt the revolutions of mind, intellect, and consciousness; stop the calculations of thoughts, ideas, and perceptions. Do not intend to make a Buddha, much less be attached to sitting.

SBGZ

Studying Zen is zazen. For zazen ONE SHOULD HAVE A QUIET PLACE. SPREAD A THICK MAT. Do not let in drafts or vapors, rain or frost: secure and maintain the place where you practice. There are examples from the past of those who sat on a vajra or on a rock; they all put down a thick layer of grass to sit on. The place where you sit should be bright, both in the daytime and at night; and it is wise to keep it warm in winter and cool in summer. CAST ASIDE ALL INVOLVEMENTS AND DISCONTINUE ALL AFFAIRS. GOOD IS NOT THOUGHT OF; EVIL IS NOT THOUGHT OF. It is not mind, intellect or consciousness; it is not thoughts, ideas or perceptions. Do not intend to make a Buddha; let drop [any notion of] sitting. BE MODERATE IN FOOD AND DRINK. Hold dear the passing time, and take to zazen as though brushing a fire from your head. Thus did the Fifth Patriarch on Huang-mei Shan devote himself solely to zazen, to the exclusion of all other activities.

CYCK

WHEN YOU SIT in meditation, SPREAD A THICK MAT IN A QUIET PLACE. LOOSEN YOUR ROBE AND BELT, AND ASSUME A PROPER DEMEANOR. THEN SIT IN THE FULL CROSS-LEGGED POSITION. FIRST PLACE YOUR RIGHT FOOT ON YOUR LEFT THIGH; THEN PLACE YOUR LEFT FOOT ON YOUR RIGHT THIGH. Or you may SIT IN THE HALF CROSS-LEGGED POSITION: SIMPLY REST YOUR LEFT FOOT ON YOUR RIGHT foot.

FKZZG (A)

WHEN YOU SIT, SPREAD A THICK MAT and use a cushion on top of it. THEN SIT IN EITHER THE FULL CROSS-LEGGED OR HALF CROSS-LEGGED POSITION. For the full position, FIRST PLACE YOUR RIGHT FOOT ON YOUR LEFT THIGH; THEN PLACE YOUR LEFT FOOT ON YOUR RIGHT THIGH. For the half position, SIMPLY REST YOUR LEFT FOOT ON YOUR RIGHT thigh.

FKZZG (B)

In the place where you regularly sit, SPREAD A THICK MAT and use a cushion on top of it. SIT IN EITHER THE FULL CROSS-LEGGED OR HALF CROSS-LEGGED POSITION. For the full position, FIRST PLACE YOUR RIGHT FOOT ON YOUR LEFT THIGH; THEN PLACE YOUR LEFT FOOT ON YOUR RIGHT THIGH. For the half position, SIMPLY REST YOUR LEFT FOOT ON YOUR RIGHT thigh.

SBGZ

WHEN YOU SIT IN MEDITATION, you should wear your surplice. Put down a cushion. The cushion should not be placed completely under your legs but only under the rear half, so that your crossed legs rest on the mat and your spine on the cushion. This is the way that all the Buddhas and Patriarchs have sat when they did zazen. SIT IN EITHER THE FULL CROSS-LEGGED OR HALF CROSS-LEGGED POSITION. For the full position, PLACE YOUR RIGHT FOOT ON YOUR LEFT THIGH, AND YOUR LEFT FOOT ON YOUR RIGHT THIGH. The toes should lie along the thighs, neither extending beyond nor falling short of them. For the half position, SIMPLY PLACE YOUR LEFT FOOT ON YOUR RIGHT thigh.

BDH

WHEN YOU SIT IN MEDITATION, use a cushion. SIT IN THE FULL CROSS-LEGGED POSITION. For the full position, FIRST PLACE YOUR RIGHT FOOT ON YOUR LEFT THIGH; THEN PLACE YOUR LEFT FOOT ON YOUR RIGHT THIGH. OR YOU MAY SIT IN THE HALF CROSS-LEGGED POSITION: SIMPLY REST YOUR LEFT FOOT ON YOUR RIGHT FOOT.

CYCK

NEXT, PLACE YOUR RIGHT HAND ON YOUR LEFT FOOT, AND YOUR LEFT HAND ON YOUR RIGHT PALM. PRESS THE TIPS OF YOUR THUMBS TOGETHER. Slowly raise your torso and stretch it forward. Swing to the left and right; THEN STRAIGHTEN YOUR BODY AND SIT ERECT. DO NOT LEAN TO THE LEFT OF RIGHT, FORWARD OR BACKWARD.

FKZZG (A)

LOOSEN YOUR ROBE AND BELT, AND ARRANGE them PROPERLY. NEXT, PLACE YOUR RIGHT HAND ON YOUR LEFT FOOT, AND YOUR LEFT HAND ON YOUR RIGHT PALM. PRESS THE TIPS OF YOUR THUMBS TOGETHER. THEN STRAIGHTEN YOUR BODY AND SIT ERECT. DO NOT LEAN TO THE LEFT OR RIGHT, FORWARD OR BACKWARD.

FKZZG (B)

LOOSEN YOUR ROBE AND BELT, AND ARRANGE them PROPERLY. NEXT, PLACE YOUR RIGHT HAND ON YOUR LEFT FOOT, AND YOUR LEFT HAND ON YOUR RIGHT PALM. PRESS THE TIPS OF YOUR THUMBS TOGETHER. THEN STRAIGHTEN YOUR BODY AND SIT ERECT. DO NOT LEAN TO THE LEFT OR RIGHT, FORWARD OR BACKWARD.

SBGZ

LOOSEN YOUR ROBE AND underwaist, AND ARRANGE them PROPERLY. PLACE YOUR RIGHT HAND ON YOUR LEFT FOOT, AND YOUR LEFT HAND ON YOUR RIGHT hand. PRESS THE TIPS OF YOUR THUMBS TOGETHER. With your hands in this position, place them against your body, so that the joined thumb tips are aligned with your navel. STRAIGHTEN YOUR BODY AND SIT ERECT. DO NOT LEAN TO THE LEFT OR RIGHT, FORWARD OR BAKCWARD.

BDH

NEXT, PLACE YOUR RIGHT HAND ON YOUR LEFT FOOT, AND YOUR LEFT HAND ON YOUR RIGHT PALM. PRESS THE TIPS OF YOUR THUMBS TOGETHER. STRAIGHTEN YOUR BODY AND SIT ERECT: align the top of your head and your backbone, so that you are upright and straight. DO NOT LEAN TO THE LEFT OR RIGHT, FORWARD, OR BACKWARD.

CYCK

Keep your hips, back, neck, and head in line, making your posture like a stūpa. But do not strain your body upward too far, lest it make your breathing forced and unsettled. YOUR EARS SHOULD BE IN LINE WITH YOUR SHOULDERS, AND YOUR NOSE IN LINE WITH YOUR NAVEL. PRESS YOUR TONGUE AGAINST THE FRONT OF YOUR PALATE, AND CLOSE YOUR LIPS AND TEETH. THE EYES SHOULD REMAIN slightly OPEN, in order to prevent drowsiness. If you attain samādhi [with the eyes open], it will be the most powerful. In ancient times there were monks eminent in the practice of meditation who always sat with their eyes open. More recently, the Ch'an master Fa-yün Yüan-t'ung criticized those who sit in meditation with their eyes closed, likening [their practice] to the ghost cave of the Black Mountain. Surely this has a deep meaning, known to those who have mastered [meditation practice.]

FKZZG (A)

YOUR EARS SHOULD BE IN LINE WITH YOUR SHOULDERS, AND YOUR NOSE IN LINE WITH YOUR NAVEL. PRESS YOUR TONGUE AGAINST THE FRONT OF YOUR PALATE, AND CLOSE YOUR LIPS AND TEETH. THE EYES SHOULD always REMAIN OPEN.

FKZZG (B)

YOUR EARS SHOULD BE IN LINE WITH YOUR SHOULDERS, AND YOUR NOSE IN LINE WITH YOUR NAVEL. PRESS YOUR TONGUE AGAINST THE FRONT OF YOUR PALATE, AND CLOSE YOUR LIPS AND TEETH. THE EYES SHOULD always REMAIN OPEN. Breathe gently through the nose.

SBGZ

YOUR EARS SHOULD BE IN LINE WITH YOUR SHOULDERS, AND YOUR NOSE IN LINE WITH YOUR NAVEL. PRESS YOUR TONGUE AGAINST THE FRONT OF YOUR PALATE. Breathe through the nose. CLOSE YOUR LIPS AND TEETH. THE EYES SHOULD BE KEPT OPEN, neither too widely nor too narrowly.

BDH

YOUR EARS SHOULD BE IN LINE WITH YOUR SHOULDERS, AND YOUR NOSE IN LINE WITH YOUR NAVEL. PRESS YOUR TONGUE AGAINST THE FRONT OF YOUR PALATE, AND CLOSE YOUR LIPS AND TEETH. THE EYES SHOULD BE properly OPEN, neither too widely nor too narrowly. Do not let your eyelids cover your pupils, nor your neck deviate from [the line of] your back. Let your breath pass through your nose; do not pant or rasp, nor make your breath too long or too short, too gentle or too forced.

<u>CYCK</u>

ONCE YOU HAVE SETTLED YOUR POSTURE AND REGULATED YOUR BREATHING, you should relax your abdomen. DO NOT THINK OF ANY GOOD OR EVIL WHATSOEVER. AS SOON AS A THOUGHT OCCURS, BE AWARE OF IT; AS SOON AS YOU ARE AWARE OF IT, IT WILL VANISH. REMAINING FOR A LONG PERIOD FORGETFUL OF OBJECTS, YOU NATURALLY BECOME UNIFIED. THIS IS THE ESSENTIAL ART OF TSO-CH'AN. Honestly speaking, TSO-CH'AN IS THE DHARMA GATE OF EASE AND JOY. If there are many people who become ill [from its practice], it is because they do not take proper care.

<u>FKZZG</u> (A)

ONCE YOU HAVE SETTLED YOUR POSTURE, YOU SHOULD REGULATE YOUR BREATHING. <u>AS SOON AS A THOUGHT OCCURS, BE AWARE OF IT; AS SOON AS YOU ARE AWARE OF IT, IT WILL VANISH. REMAINING FOR A LONG PERIOD FORGETFUL OF OBJECTS, YOU NATURALLY BECOME UNIFIED.</u> THIS IS THE ESSENTIAL ART OF ZAZEN. ZAZEN IS THE DHARMA GATE OF <u>great</u> EASE AND JOY.

<u>FKZZG</u> (B)

ONCE YOU HAVE REGULATED YOUR POSTURE, <u>take a breath and exhale fully. SWING TO THE LEFT AND RIGHT. Sit solidly, like a rock. Think of not-thinking. How do you think of not-thinking? Non-thinking.</u> THIS IS THE ESSENTIAL ART OF ZAZEN. ZAZEN IS <u>not the practice of dhyāna</u>: <u>it is just</u> THE DHARMA GATE OF EASE AND JOY. <u>It is the practice and verification of ultimate bodhi. The kōan is realized; nets and cages cannot get to it.</u>

<u>SBGZ</u>

HAVING THUS REGULATED BODY <u>and mind</u>, take a breath and exhale fully. Sit solidly, like a rock. Think of not-thinking. How do you think of not-thinking? Non-thinking. THIS IS THE ART OF ZAZEN. ZAZEN IS not the practice of dhyāna: it is THE DHARMA GATE OF great EASE AND JOY. <u>It is undefiled practice and verification.</u>

<u>BDH</u>

HAVING REGULATED BODY and mind, <u>RAISE YOUR TORSO</u> and exhale fully <u>several times</u>. <u>RELAX both inside and out.</u> SWING TO THE LEFT AND RIGHT <u>seven or eight times</u>. Sit solidly, like a rock. Think of not-thinking. How do you think of not-thinking? Non-thinking. THIS IS THE ESSENTIAL ART OF ZAZEN.

CYCK

IF YOU GRASP THE POINT OF THIS [PRACTICE], THE FOUR ELEMENTS [OF THE BODY] WILL BECOME LIGHT AND AT EASE, THE SPIRIT WILL BE FRESH AND SHARP, THOUGHTS WILL BE CORRECT AND CLEAR; THE FLAVOR OF THE DHARMA WILL SUSTAIN THE SPIRIT, AND YOU WILL BE CALM, PURE, AND JOYFUL. ONE WHO HAS ALREADY ACHIEVED CLARIFICATION [OF THE TRUTH] MAY BE LIKENED TO THE DRAGON GAINING THE WATER OR THE TIGER TAKING TO THE MOUNTAINS. And even one who has not yet achieved it, by letting the wind fan the flame, will not have to make much effort. Just assent to it; you will not be deceived. Nevertheless, as the path gets higher, demons flourish, and agreeable and disagreeable experiences are manifold. YET IF YOU JUST KEEP RIGHT THOUGHT PRESENT, none of them can obstruct you. The Śūraṅgama-sūtra, T'ien-t'ai's Chih-kuan, and Kuei-feng's Hsiu-cheng i give detailed explications of these demonic occurances, and those who would be prepared in advance for the unforeseen should be familiar with them.

FKZZG (A)

IF YOU GRASP THE POINT OF THIS [PRACTICE], THE FOUR ELEMENTS [OF THE BODY] WILL BECOME LIGHT AND AT EASE, THE SPIRIT WILL BE FRESH AND SHARP, THOUGHTS WILL BE CORRECT AND CLEAR; THE FLAVOR OF THE DHARMA WILL SUSTAIN THE SPIRIT, AND YOU WILL BE CALM, PURE, AND JOYFUL. Your daily life will be [the expression of] your true natural state. ONCE YOU HAVE ACHIEVED CLARIFICATION [OF THE TRUTH], YOU MAY BE LIKENED TO THE DRAGON GAINING THE WATER OR THE TIGER TAKING TO THE MOUNTAINS. You should realize that WHEN RIGHT THOUGHT IS PRESENT, dullness and agitation cannot intrude.

FKZZG (B)

IF YOU GRASP THE POINT OF THIS [PRACTICE], YOU ARE LIKE THE DRAGON GAINING THE WATER OR THE TIGER TAKING TO THE MOUNTAINS. You should realize that WHEN RIGHT THOUGHT IS PRESENT, dullness and agitation are, from the start, struck aside.

CYCK

When you come out of samādhi, MOVE SLOWLY AND ARISE CALMLY; DO NOT BE HASTY OR ROUGH. After you have left samādhi, ALWAYS employ appropriate means to PROTECT AND MAINTAIN THE POWER OF SAMĀDHI, as though you were protecting an infant. Then your samādhi power will easily develop. THIS ONE TEACHING OF MEDITATION is our most urgent business. If you do not practice meditation and enter dhyāna, then when it comes down to it, to will be completely at a loss. Therefore, in seeking a pearl, you should still the waves; if you disturb the water, it will be difficult to get. When the water of meditation is clear, the pearl of the mind will appear of itself. Therefore, the Yüan-chüeh ching says, "Unimpeded, immaculate wisdom always arises dependent on meditation." The Saddharma-puṇḍarīka-sūtra says, "In a quiet place, practice the control of the mind, abiding motionless like Mt. Sumeru."

FKZZG (A)

When you arise from sitting, MOVE SLOWLY AND ARISE CALMLY; DO NOT BE HASTY OR ROUGH. AT ALL TIMES PROTECT AND MAINTAIN THE POWER OF SAMĀDHI. In studying and investigating it, you transcend its higher workings; for there is no basis to rely on. In verifying and letting go of it, you are obstructed by the self; therein you are never impeded. This is the full realization of the way. Truly THIS ONE TEACHING OF MEDITATION is the highest, the supreme. To first display a full understanding and then turn to half a verification -- such exists only in this dharma. To hold up a flower and break into a smile, to make a bow and attain the marrow -- such represents the great freedom gained through the power of its grace. How could BODHISATTVAS WHO STUDY PRAJÑĀ fail to follow and accord with it?

FKZZG (B)

When you arise from sitting, MOVE SLOWLY AND ARISE CALMLY; DO NOT BE HASTY OR ROUGH.

BDH

When you arise from sitting, ARISE SLOWLY.

CYCK

Thus, TRANSCENDING THE PROFANE AND SURPASSING THE HOLY ARE ALWAYS CONTINGENT ON THE CONDITION OF DHYĀNA; SHEDDING [THIS BODY] WHILE SEATED AND FLEEING [THIS LIFE] WHILE STANDING ARE necessarily dependent on THE POWER OF SAMĀDHI.

FKZZG (A)

Considering the past, we see that TRANSCENDING THE PROFANE AND SURPASSING THE HOLY ARE ALWAYS CONTINGENT ON THE CONDITION OF DHYĀNA; SHEDDING [THIS BODY] WHILE SEATED AND FLEEING [THIS LIFE] WHILE STANDING ARE fully subject to THE POWER OF SAMĀDHI. Surely, then, turning the opportunity with a finger, a pole, a needle or a mallet, and verifying the accord with a wisk, a fist, a staff or a shout -- these are not to be understood through the discriminations of thinking; much less can they be known through the practice and verification of supernormal powers. They must represent conduct beyond sound and form; how could they not be a standard before knowledge and understanding?

FKZZG (B)

Considering the past, we see that TRANSCENDING THE PROFANE AND SURPASSING THE HOLY, SHEDDING [THIS BODY] WHILE SEATED AND FLEEING [THIS LIFE] WHILE STANDING ARE totally subject to this POWER. Surely, then, to grasp the turning of the opportunity through a finger, a pole, a needle or a mallet, and to present the verification of the accord with a wisk, a fist, a staff or a shout -- these are not to be understood through the discriminations of thinking; much less can they be known through the practice and verification of supernormal powers. They must represent conduct beyond sound and form; how could they not be a standard before knowledge and understanding?

FKZZG (A)

Therefore, it does not matter whether one is very smart or very stupid; there is no distinction between those of sharp and dull faculties. If you let go of the six senses, you see and turn the whole path; if you do not produce a single thought, you sit and cut off the ten directions. Both in our world and the other quarters the Buddha dharma has no other dharma; from the Western country to the Eastern land the Patriarch's teaching opened five gates. All equally maintain the Buddha seal, while enjoys its own style of teaching. They devote themselves only to single transmission and direct pointing; they engage solely in reversing the body and turning the head. Though they speak of a thousand differences and ten thousand distinctions, they only delight in the full investigation of the homeward course.

FKZZG (B)

Therefore, it does not matter whether one is very smart or very stupid; there is no distinction between those of sharp and dull faculties. Singleminded exertion is itself pursuit of the way. Practice and verification are by nature undefiled. Advancement [to enlightenment] is just an everyday affair. In our world and the other quarters, from the Western country to the Eastern land, all equally maintain the Buddha seal, while each enjoys its own style of teaching. They devote themselves only to sitting; they are obstructed by solid sitting. Though they speak of ten thousand distinctions and a thousand differences, they only study Zen and pursue the way.

CYCK

Even if one devotes himself to the practice his entire life, he may still not be in time; how then could one who procrastinates possibly overcome karma? Therefore, an ancient has said, "Without the power of samādhi, you will meekly cower at death's door." Shutting your eyes, you will end your life in vain; and just as you are you will drift [in saṃsāra].

FKZZG (A)

Why leave behind the seat in your own home to wander in vain through the dusty regions of foreign lands? If you make one false step, you miss what is right before you. Since you have already attained the proper conjunction for a human body, do not pass your days in vain; when one always bears in mind the appropriate conduct of the way of the Buddha, who can carelessly enjoy the spark from a flint. Surely, form and substance are like the dew on the grass, and the fortunes of life like the lightening flash: in an instant they are empty, in a moment they are lost.

FKZZG (B)

Why abandon the seat in your own home to wander in vain through the dusty regions of foreign lands? If you make one false step, you miss what is right before you. Since you have already attained the key essential of a human body, do not pass your days in vain; when one takes care of the essential key of the way of Buddha, who can carelessly enjoy the spark from a flint? Surely, form and substance are like the dew on the grass, and the fortunes of life like the lightening flash: in an instant they are empty, in a moment they are lost.

CYCK

Friends in Ch'an, go over this text again and again. Benefiting others as well ourselves, let us together achieve full enlightenment.

FKZZG (A)

Eminent students [of the dharma], long accustomed to groping for the elephant, pray do not doubt the true dragon. Promptly take the right way, which points directly at reality; quickly become the real man, through with learning and free from action. Then will you comply with the rule of Po-chang and everywhere communicate the news of Shao-lin. Do not trouble yourself over winds that offend the ear, nor be upset by sounds of the beating tongue. Just directly open your own treasure store and use it as you will.

FKZZG (B)

Eminent students [of the dharma], long accustomed to groping for the elephant, pray do not doubt the true dragon. Apply yourselves to the way which points directly at reality; honor the man who is through with learning and free from action. Accord with the bodhi of all the Buddhas; succeed to the samādhi of all the Patriarchs. If you act this way for a long time, you will be this way. Your treasure store will open of itself, and you will use it as you will.

SELECTED LIST OF WORKS CITED

A. Collections of Buddhist Texts

Dai Nihon bukkyō zensho 大日本仏教全書. Tokyo: Bussho Kankōkai, 1912-22. 150 vols.

Dai Nihon zoku zōkyō 大日本続蔵経. Kyoto: Zōkyō Shoin, 1905-12. 750 vols.

Dōgen zenji zenshū 道元禅師全集. Ed. by Ōkubo Dōshū 大久保道舟. Tokyo: Chikuma Shobō, 1969-70. 2 vols.

Eihei Shōbōgenzō shūsho taisei 永平正法眼蔵蒐書大成. Tokyo: Taishūkan, 1974-. 20 vols.

Shōwa hōbō sōmokuroku 昭和法宝総目録. Tokyo: Taishō Issai-kyō Kankōkai, 1929-34. 3 vols.

Sōtō-shū zensho 曹洞宗全書. Tokyo: Kōmeisha, 1929-38. 20 vols.

Taishō shinshū daizōkyō 大正新脩大蔵経. Tokyo: Taishō Issaikyō Kankōkai, 1924-33. 85 vols.

B. Works by Dōgen

Bendō-hō 辨道法. *DZZ*, 2, 313-19.

Bendō-wa 辨道話. *DZZ*, 1, 729-63.

Eihei Gen zenji goroku 永平元禅師語録. *SSZ*, Shūgen 宗源, 2, 27-42

Eihei kōroku 永平廣録. *DZZ*, 2, 7-200.

Eihei shingi 永平清規. *T*. 2584.

Fukan zazen-gi 普勸坐禪儀. *DZZ*, 2, 3-5; 165-66.

"*Fukan zazen-gi* senjutsu yurai" 普勸坐禪儀撰述由來. *DZZ*, 2, 6.

Gakudō yōjin-shū 學道用心集. *DZZ*, 2, 253-60.

Hōkyō-ki 寶慶記. *DZZ*, 2, 371-88.

"Ju Kakushin kaimyaku" 授覺心戒脈. *DZZ*, 2, 291.

"Shari sōden-ki" 舍利相傳記. *DZZ*, 2, 395-96.

Shōbōgenzō 正法眼藏. *DZZ*, 1.

Ango 安居. 568-84.

Bukkyō 佛教. 306-14.

Bukkyō 佛經. 405-14.

Butsudō 佛道. 376-88.

Gyōbutsu igi 行佛威儀. 46-58.

Gyōji 行持. 122-61.

Jinshin inga 深信因果. 676-81.

Jishō zanmai 自證三昧. 552-60.

Ōsaku sendaba 王索仙陀婆. 594-96.

Sanjūshichi bon bodai bunpō 三十七品菩提分法. 502-18.

Shisho 嗣書. 337-47.

Tashin tsū 他心通. 585-93.

Zanmai ō zanmai 三昧王三昧. 359-41.

Zazen-gi 坐禪儀. 88-89.

Zazen-shin 坐禪箴. 90-101.

Shōbōgenzō sanbyaku soku 正法眼藏三百則. *DZZ*, 2, 201-52.

Shōbōgenzō zuimon-ki 正法眼藏隨聞記 *DZZ*, 2, 419-95.

Tenzo kyōkun 典座教訓. *DZZ*, 2, 295-303.

"Uji Kannon-dōri-in sōdo kenritsu kanjin-sho" 宇治觀音導利院僧堂建立勸進疏. *DZZ*, 2, 400-01.

"Zazen-shin" 坐禪箴. *DZZ*, 2, 166.

C. *Works in Buddhist Collections*

A-ji kan yōjin kuketsu 阿字觀用心口訣. *T*. 2432.

Ch'an-men k'ou-chüeh 禪門口訣. *T*. 1919.

"Ch'an-men kuei-shih" 禪門規式. *T*. 2076, 250-51.

Ch'an-men yao-lüeh 禪門要略. *ZZ*. 2, 4, 35-37.

Ch'an-men yao-fa ching 禪門要法經. *T*. 613.

Ch'an-yüan ch'ing-kuei 禪苑清規. *ZZ*. 2, 16, 438-71; Kagamishima, et al., *Yakuchū Zen'en shingi*.

Ch'an-yüan chu-ch'üan chi tu-shü 禪源諸詮集都序. *T*. 2015.

Cheng-tao ko 證道歌. *T*. 2014.

Chia-t'ai p'u-teng lu 嘉泰普燈錄. *ZZ*. 2B, 10, 1-219.

Ch'ih-hsiu Po-chang ch'ing-kuei 勅修百丈清規. *T*. 2025.

Chih-kuan fu-hsing ch'uan-hung chüeh 止觀輔行傳弘決. *T*. 1912.

Ching-te ch'uan-teng lu 景德傳燈錄. *T*. 2076.

Chüeh-i san-mei 覺意三昧. *T*. 1922.

Denkō-roku 傳光錄. *T*. 2585.

Eihei-ji sanso gyōgō-ki 永平三祖行業記. *SSZ*, Shiden 史伝, 1.

Erh-ju ssu-hsing lun 二入四行論. *T*. 2009, 369-70;

Suzuki Daisetsu, *Zen shisō-shi kenkyū*, 2, pp. 141-61.

Fukan zazen-gi monge 普勸坐禪儀聞解. *SSZ*, Chūkai 註解, 3, 3-33.

Honchō kōsō den 本朝高僧傳. *Dai Nihon bukkyō zensho*, 102.

Hsin-hsin ming 信心銘. *T*. 2010.

Hsiu-ch'an yao-chüeh 修禪要訣. *ZZ*, 2, 15, 417-20.

Hsiu-hsi chih-kuan tso-ch'an fa-yao 修習止觀坐禪法要. *T*. 1915.

Hsiu-hsin yao lun 修心要論. *T*. 2011; Suzuki Daisetsu, *Zen shisō-shi kenkyū*, 2, pp. 303-09.

Hsü ch'uan-teng lu 續傳燈錄. *T*. 2077.

Hsü kao-seng chuan 續高僧傳. *T*. 2060.

I-ch'ieh ching ying-i 一切經音義. *T*. 2128.

Keiran shūyō shū 溪嵐拾葉集. *T*. 2410.

Kenzei-ki 建撕記. *SSZ*, shiden, 2.

Kōzen gokoku ron 興禪護國論. *T*. 2543.

Leng-chia shih-tzu chi 楞伽師資記. *T*. 2837.

Lien-teng hui-yao 聯燈會要. *ZZ*, 2B, 9, 208-475.

Lin-chien lu 林間錄. *ZZ*, 2B, 21, 293-324.

Lin-chi lu 臨濟錄. *T*. 1985.

Liu-tsu t'an ching 六祖壇經. *T*. 2007; Nakagawa Taka, *Rokuso dankyō*.

Miao-fa lien-hua ching wen-chü 妙法蓮華經文句. *T*. 1718.

Mo-ho chih-kuan 摩訶止觀. *T*. 1911.

Nan-yang ho-shang t'an yü 南陽和尚壇語. Hu Shih, *Nan-yang ho-shang i-chi*, pp. 223-52.

Nyojō oshō goroku 如淨和尚語錄. T. 2002A.

"Pieh-li ch'an-chü 別立禪居. T. 2126, 240.

Pi-yen lu 碧巖錄. T. 2003.

Po-chang kuei-sheng sung 百丈規繩頌. ZZ, 2, 16, 465-71.

P'u-t'i-ta-mo nan-tsung ting shih-fei lun 菩提達摩南宗定是非論. T. 85, appendix; Hu Shih, Nan-yang ho-shang i-chi, pp. 258-318.

Shan chien lü p'i-p'o-sha 善見律毘婆沙. T. 1462.

Shibu roku 四部錄. Ōmori Sōgen, Kunchū Zenshū shibu roku.

Shih ch'an po-lo-mi tz'u-ti fa-men 釋禪波羅蜜次第法門. T. 1916.

Shih sung lü 十誦律. T. 1435.

"Shih-t'ou ho-shang ts'ao-an ko" 石頭和尚草庵歌. T. 2076, 461.

Shikan zazen-ki 止觀坐禪記. Dai Nihon bukkyō zensho, 31, 267-72.

Shou-leng-yen ching 首楞嚴經. T. 945.

Sung kao-seng chuan 宋高僧傳. T. 2061.

Ta-hui shu 大慧書. T. 1998A, 916-42.

Ta-hui P'u-chüeh ch'an-shih t'a-ming 大慧普覺禪師塔銘. T. 1998A, 836-37.

T'ang Hung-chou Po-chang Shan ku Huai-hai ch'an-shih t'a-ming 唐洪州百丈山故懷海禪師塔銘. Ch'üan T'ang wen 全唐文, 446, 4-7.

Ta pao chi ching 大寶積經. T. 310.

Ta-sheng ch'i hsin lun i-chi 大乘起信論義記. T. 1846.

Ta-tsang i-lan 大藏一覽. Hōbō sōmokuroku, 75.

Tendō-san Keitoku-ji Nyojō zenji zoku goroku 天童山景德寺如淨禪師續語錄 *T*. 2002B.

T'ien-t'ai hsiao chih-kuan 天台小止觀 . *T*. 1915; Sekiguchi Shindai, *Tendai shō shikan no kenkyū*, pp. 321-64.

Tō dai oshō tōsei den 唐大和尚東征傳. *T*. 2089, 988-95.

"Tso-ch'an chen" 坐禪箴, by Hung-chih 宏智 . *T*. 2001, 98.

Tso-ch'an i 坐禪儀, by Tsung-tse 宗賾. *ZZ*. 2, 16, 460-61.

Tun-wu ju-tao yao-men 頓悟入道要門. *ZZ*, 2, 15, 420-26.

Tzu-men ching-hsün 緇門警訓. *T*. 2023.

Wen-shu so shuo fo ching-chieh ching 文殊所說佛境界經. *T*. 340.

Wen-shu wen ching 文殊問經 . *T*. 468.

Wu-men kuan 無門關. *T*. 2005.

Wu-wei san-tsang ch'an-yao 無畏三藏禪要 . *T*. 917.

Yüan-chüeh ching tao-ch'ang hsiu-cheng i 圓覺經道場修證儀. *ZZ*, 2B, 1, 361-498.

Yüan-chüeh ching ta-shu ch'ao 圓覺經大疏鈔. *ZZ*, 1, 14, 204-15, 41.

Yün-men kuang-lu 雲門廣錄. *T*. 1988.

Zazen yōjin-ki 坐禪用心記. *T*. 2586.

Zenmon shishi shōshū zu 禪門師資承襲圖. *ZZ*, 2, 15, 433-38.

D. *Modern works*

Akishige Yoshiharu 秋重義治. "*Fukan zazen-gi* kō" 普勸坐禪儀考 . *Tetsugaku nenpō* 哲学年報 , 14 (1953), pp. 459-80.

Demiéville, Paul. *Le Concile de Lhasa*. Paris: Impremerie Nationale de France, 1952.

Donner, Neal. "The Great Calming and Contemplation of Chih-i." Ph. D. dissertation, University of British Columbia, 1976.

Dumoulin, Heinrich. "Allgemeine Lehren zur Förderung des Zazen von Zen-Meister Dōgen." *Monumenta Nipponica*, 4 (1958), pp. 429-36.

Furuta Shōkin 古田紹欽. *Nihon bukkyō shisō-shi no sho-mondai* 日本仏教思想史の諸問題. Tokyo: Shunjūsha, 1964.

_______________. *Shōbōgenzō no kenkyū* 正法眼蔵の研究. Tokyo: Sōbunsha, 1972.

Hōbōgirin 法宝義林: *Dictionnaire encyclopédique du Bouddhisme*. Tokyo: Maison Franco-Japonaise, 1929-.

Hu Shih 胡適. *Shen-hui ho-shang i-chi* 神會和尚遺集. Rev. ed. Taipei: Hu Shih Chi-nien Kuan, 1970.

Ichikawa Hakugen 市川白弦, et. al. *Chūsei zenke no shisō* 中世禅家の思想. *Nihon shisō taikei* 日本思想大系 16. Tokyo: Iwanami Shoten, 1972.

Imaeda Aishin 今枝愛真. *Chūsei zenshū-shi no kenkyū* 中世禅宗史の研究. Tokyo: Tōkyō Daigaku Shuppankai, 1970.

_______________. *Dōgen: Zazen hitosuji no shamon* 道元：坐禅ひとすじの沙門. NHK bukkusu 225. Tokyo: Nihon Hōsō Shuppankai, 1976.

Itō Toshimitsu 伊藤俊光. *Eihei kōroku chūkai zensho*

永平広録註解全書. 3 vols. Tokyo: Eihei Kōroku Chūkai Zensho Kankōkai, 1961.

______________. "Rinnō-ji Tenkai zō shahon _Eihei kōroku_ ni tsuite" 輪王寺天海蔵写本永平広録について. _SK_, 4 (3/1962), pp. 31-36.

Kagamishima Genryū 鏡島元隆. _Dōgen zenji to inyō kyōten goroku no kenkyū_ 道元禅師と引用経典語録の研究. Tokyo: Mokujisha, 1965.

______________. "Dōgen zenji to Sōchō zen" 道元禅師と宋朝禅. _Nihon bukkyō gakkai nenpō_ 日本仏教学会年報, 26 (1960), pp. 57-72.

______________. "_Eihei kōroku_ to _Ryakuroku_" 永平広録と略録. _Komazawa daigaku kenkyū kiyō_ 駒沢大学研究紀要, 15 (3/1957), pp. 55-64.

______________. "Hyakujō ko shingi henka katei no ichi kōsatsu" 百丈古清規変化過程の一考察. _KDBGKK_, 25 (3/1967), pp. 1-13.

______________. "_Nyojō goroku_ to _Hōkyō-ki_" 如浄語録と宝慶記. _Sanshō_ 傘松, special number 50 (11/1975), pp. 77-83.

______________. "Nyojō to Dōgen" 如浄と道元. In _Dōgen zen no shisō-teki kenkyū_ 道元禅の思想的研究, ed. by Kurebayashi Kōdō 榑林皓堂. Tokyo: Shunjūsha, 1973.

______________, et al. _Yakuchū Zen'en shingi_ 訳註禅苑清規. Tokyo: Sōtō-shū Shūmu-chō, 1972.

Kajitani Sōnin 梶谷宗忍, et al. _Shinjin-mei, Shōdō-ka_,

Jūgyō-zu, Zazen-gi 信心銘証道歌十牛図坐禅儀. Zen no goroku 禅の語録 16. Tokyo: Chikuma Shobō, 1971.

Kamata Shigeo 鎌田茂雄. Shūmitsu kyōgaku no shishō-shi teki kenkyū 宗密教学の思想史的研究. Tokyo: Tōkyō Daigaku Shuppankai, 1975.

Kennett, Rōshi Jiyu. Zen is Eternal Life. Emeryville, Calif.: Dharma Publishing, 1976.

Kinoshita Jun'ichi 木下純一. "Fukan zazen-gi no kenkyū" 普勧坐禅儀の研究. SK, 7 (4/1965), 132-37.

Kodera, James. "Dōgen's Formative Years in China: Historical Study and Annotated Translation of the Hōkyō-ki." Ph. D. Dissertation, Columbia University, 1976.

Kondō Ryōichi 近藤良一. "Hyakujō shingi to Eihei shingi" 百丈清規と永平清規, IBK, 13, 1 (1/1965), 297-300.

Kozaka Kiyū 小坂機融. "Shingi hensen no teiryū 清規変遷の底流 (1)." SK, 5 (4/1963), pp. 123-29.

Lamotte, Étienne. Le Traité de la Grande Vertu de Sagesse. 4 vols. Louvain: Institut Orientaliste, 1949-.

Lu K'uan Yü. The Secrets of Chinese Meditation. New York: Samuel Weiser, 1969.

Masutani Fumio 増谷文雄. Rinzai to Dōgen 臨済と道元. Tokyo: Shunjūsha, 1971.

Mizuno Kōgen 水野弘元. "Ritsuzō ni arawareta zen no jissen" 律蔵に現れた禅の実践. In Shikan no kenkyū 止観の研究, ed. by Sekiguchi Shindai. Tokyo:

Iwanami Shoten, 1975.

______________. "Zenshū seiritsu izen no Shina no zenjō shishō-shi josetsu" 禅宗成立以前のシナの禅定思想史の序説. Komazawa daigaku kenkyū kiyō, 15 (3/1957), pp. 15-54.

Nagahisa Gakusui 永久岳水. "Eihei kōroku no kenkyū" 永平広録の研究. SK, 15 (3/1973), pp. 3-8.

Nagahisa Toshio 永久俊雄. "Fukan zazen-gi no kenkyū" 普勧坐禅儀の研究. SK, 5 (4/1963), pp. 9-13.

Nakagawa Taka 中川孝. Rokuso dankyō 六祖壇経. Zen no goroku 4. Tokyo: Chikuma Shobō, 1976.

Ōkubo Dōshū 大久保道舟. Dōgen zenji den no kenkyū 道元禅師伝の研究. Rev. ed. Tokyo: Chikuma Shobō, 1966.

______________. Dōgen zenji goroku 道元禅師語録. Iwanami bunko 岩波文庫 2211-12. Tokyo: Iwanami Shoten, 1940.

______________. Dōgen zenji shinpitsu shūsei 道元禅師真筆集成. Supplement to DZZ. Tokyo: Chikuma Shobō, 1970.

______________. Teihōn Dōgen zenji zenshū 定本道元禅師全集. 2 vols. Rev. ed. Tokyo: Shunjūsha, 1944.

______________. Zen'en bokka 禅苑墨華. 2 vols. Repr. Tokyo: Kokusho Kankōkai, 1974.

Ōmori Sōgen 大森曹玄. Kunchū Zenshū shibu-roku 訓註禅宗四部録. Kyoto: Kichūdō, 1962.

Sekiguchi Shindai 関口真大. Tendai shikan no kenkyū 天台止観の研究. Tokyo: Iwanami Shoten, 1969.

______________. Tendai shō shikan 天台小止観. Iwanami bunko 33-309-3. Tokyo: Iwanami Shoten, 1974.

______________. Tendai shō shikan no kenkyū 天台小止観の研究. Repr. Tokyo: Sankibō Busshorin, 1961.

Shibata Dōken 柴田道賢. Zenji Dōgen no shisō 禅師道元の思想. Tokyo: Kōronsha, 1975.

Shiina Kōyū 椎名宏雄. "Nanshū no zazen kan to sono tokushoku" 南宗の坐禅観とその特色. SK, 13 (3/1971), pp. 140-43.

Suzuki Daisetsu 鈴木大拙, "Dōgen, Hakuin, Bankei: Three Types of Thought in Japanese Zen." Trans. by Norman Waddell. The Eastern Buddhist, new series 9, 1 (5/1976), pp. 1-17.

______________. Zen shisō-shi kenkyū 禅思想史研究. 3 vols. Repr. Suzuki Daisetsu zenshū 鈴木大拙全集. Vols. 1-3. Tokyo: Iwanami Shoten, 1968.

Takasaki Jikidō 高崎直道. "Mukyū no butsugyō" 無窮の仏行. In Kobutsu no manabi (Dōgen) 古仏のまなび (道元), by Takasaki and Umehara Takeshi 梅原猛. Bukkyō no shisō 仏教の思想 11. Tokyo: Kadokawa Shoten, 1969.

Takeuchi Michio 竹内道雄. Dōgen 道元. Jinbutsu sōsho 人物叢書 88. Tokyo: Yoshikawa Kōbunkan, 1962.

______________. "Eihei Dōgen to Hekigan-roku" 永平道元と碧巌録. SK, 1 (3/1956), pp. 110-31.

________________. "Futatabi Dōgen zenji no *Ichiya Hekigan shōrai ni tsuite*" 再び道元禅師の一夜碧巌将来について. *SK*, 19 (3/1977), pp. 22-27.

Ui Hakuju 宇井伯寿 . *Zenshū-shi no kenkyū* 禅宗史の研究. 3 vols. Tokyo: Iwanami Shoten, 1939-43.

Waddell, Norman and Abe Masao. "Dōgen's *Fukanzazengi* and *Shōbōgenzō zazengi*." *The Eastern Buddhist*, new series 6, 2 (10/1973), pp. 115-28.

Yamauchi Shun'yū 山内舜雄. "*Zazen-gi* to *Tendai shō shikan*" 坐禅儀と天台小止観. *SK*, 8 (4/1966), pp. 29-50.

Yanagida Seizan 柳田聖山 . "Dōgen to Rinzai 道元と臨済. *Risō* 理想, 513 (2/1976), pp. 81-83.

________________. "Yōsai to Kōzen gokoku ron no kadai" 栄西と興禅護国論の課題. In *Chūsei zenke no shisō*, ed. by Ichikawa Hakugen, et al.

Yokoi Kakudō 横井覚道. "*Fukan zazen-gi* go-shinpitsu bon ni tsuite" 普勧坐禅儀御真筆本について. *SK*, 11 (3/1696), pp. 78-90.

________________. *Fukusei kansu bon go-shinpitsu Fukan zazen-gi* 複製巻子本御真筆普勧坐禅儀. Fukui-ken: Dai Honzan Eihei-ji, 1969.